LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 23 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division BT
Section 88
.C36
1930

# FREEDOM AND RESTRAINT

*THE JAMES SPRUNT LECTURES, 1930*
*Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.*

LIBRARY OF PRINCETO
MAR 23 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINAR

# FREEDOM AND RESTRAINT

By

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL, A.M., D.D.

*Pastor of First Presbyterian Church,*
*Asheville, N. C.*

New York Chicago
Fleming H. Revell Company
London and Edinburgh

Copyright, 1930 by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 851 Cass Street
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 99 George Street

*To my Wife*

*Under whose benign reign*
*I enjoy freedom—with restraint.*

# THE JAMES SPRUNT LECTURES

IN 1911 Mr. James Sprunt of Wilmington, North Carolina, gave to the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia the sum of thirty thousand dollars, since increased by his generosity to fifty thousand dollars, for the purpose of establishing a perpetual lectureship, which would enable the institution to secure from time to time the services of distinguished ministers and authoritative scholars, outside the regular Faculty, as special lecturers on subjects connected with various departments of Christian thought and Christian work.

The lecturers are chosen by the Faculty of the Seminary and a committee of the Board of Trustees, and the lectures are published after their delivery in accordance with a contract between the lecturer and these representatives of the institution. The series of lectures on this foundation for the year 1930 is presented in this volume.

B. R. LACY, JR.

*President, Union Theological*
*Seminary in Virginia.*

# PREFACE

IN their letter informing me that I had been chosen to this Lectureship, the Committee of the Faculty suggested that I take for my subject, *The Teaching Pastor.* After wrestling manfully with the theme, I found that it did not grip me.

It was then that a friendly correspondent suggested that I discuss *Personal Liberty* in some of its phases, adding that it was "a very timely theme." This took hold of me at once, and this series of lectures on *Freedom and Restraint* is the result.

That it is a timely theme is evidenced by the number of volumes recently published that treat of its various aspects, and by the reasons given by the authors for writing on the subject. I cite a few of these as examples:

"The problem of the mutual relations between Authority and Freedom, and of the vital necessity for a synthesis between the two principles, is from some points of view the most urgent of all the problems which confront the Christian theologian of today." A. E. J. Rawlinson, B. D.,—*Authority and Freedom.*

"The idea of Liberty, in one form or another, dominates the religious life of the present day." Willard L. Sperry, D. D.,—*The Disciplines of Liberty.*

"The problem of freedom and restraint, of impulse and reason . . . comes far to the fore today in world-wide perplexity." Geo. A. Coe—*The Motives of Men*—p. 196.

A prominent theological professor writes me: "Christian Liberty is the most vital and interesting topic in the Church today, especially among our younger ministers."

Lectures III, V and VI, of this series are based on papers read by the author before the *Pen and Plate Club* of Asheville, N. C. Papers III and VI were afterwards published in the *Union Seminary Review*, and paper V was issued as a pamphlet by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.

In preparing the lectures these papers have been revised and expanded, and in parts rewritten.

R. F. C.

*Asheville, N. C.*

# CONTENTS

I

FREEDOM AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE SCRIPTURES . . . . . . . . . . . . 11

II

THE SPIRIT AND THE LETTER . . . . . . . . 41

III

THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE INSTITUTION . . . 72

IV

FREEDOM AND THE LAW OF THE STATE . . . . 98

V

SUNDAY LAWS AND LIBERTY . . . . . . . 123

VI

THE IDEAL AND THE PRACTICAL . . . . . . 143

VII

"THE LAW OF LIBERTY" AND SELF-RESTRAINT 164

VIII

WHOSE MAN? . . . . . . . . . . . . 190

## I

# FREEDOM AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE SCRIPTURES

THIRTY years ago, there issued from the press what may be called an epoch-making book, entitled *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit.* It came from the pen of Auguste Sabatier, late Dean of the Protestant Faculty of Theology in the University of Paris.

Sabatier's thesis is what he calls the antagonism between the method of traditional Theology and the method of the kindred group of Theologies conceived in modern terms. "In the former," says he, "the method of authority still reigns. The latter depend only upon experience. It follows that between the two there can be no bond nor any common standard. . . . The two methods are so radically opposed that to accept the latter is at once to mark the former as insufficient and outworn." (Auguste Sabatier, *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit,* p. xv.) In his view a religion of authority cannot be at the same time a religion of the Spirit. It will be seen from this that Sabatier's lineage may be traced through Ritschl back to Schleiermacher, the apostle and high priest of experience as the criterion of truth.

Sabatier's book may be called epoch-making because since its publication an increasing stream of volumes with practically the same thesis has flowed from the press. One of the latest of these is *"The Authority of the Bible,"* by Professor C. H. Dodd, of Mansfield College, Oxford, in which the idea of the Scriptures as an infallible external authority is rejected in favour of the internal authority of experience. (See an able review by Le Roy Gresham, *Union Seminary Review*, July 1929, pp. 456-489.)

Concerning the position taken by those who make personal insight and experience the only criterion of truth, and who declare that an external and infallible standard of authority is inconsistent with freedom, several things should be said.

It is true that external authority demanding *implicit and blind* obedience is inconsistent with freedom. Submission to an external standard of truth is consistent with moral freedom and integrity only as a man sees and accepts it for himself as true. A prescribed course of conduct becomes the path of righteousness for a moral agent only when he follows it as his path of duty because he sees it to be right. In other words, prescriptions of truth and duty must be digested by our own reason and conscience, and must be assimilated by our own experience, before they can become operative for us without destroying our freedom.

But those who exalt experience as the criterion of truth in religion seem to forget that there are diseases of experience inherent in man's fallen nature, corrupting both reason and conscience, and that there is also such a thing as an immature or undernourished experience. The Bible is medicine for the diseased experience and food for the experience that is immature or undernourished.

Paul writes to the Corinthians that they are babes in need of milk, and infected with the carnal diseases of jealousy and strife, of which they need to be healed. (I Cor. 3:1-3.) He exhorts them not to be "children in mind," which implies immaturity in experience of the truth; "Nevertheless" says he, "in malice," which is a disease of maturity, "be ye children." (I Cor. 14:20.) Malice is not a characteristic of children nor of the childlike.

In the same strain the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews complains of arrested development in those to whom he is writing, that though considering the time they ought to be teachers, they need to be taught the rudiments, the "a b c," the elementary principles of God's Word. "Ye are become such as have need of milk, and not of solid food. For every one that partaketh of milk is *without experience* of the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But solid food is for full grown men, even those *who by reason of use have their senses exercised* to discern good and evil." (Heb. 5:12-14.)

We see therefore that experience begins as an infant and must be fed; that conscience must be exercised and nourished if it is to be quick and active to discern good and evil. But infantile paralysis as well as undernourishment may arrest development. There is need both of food and of physic. "As newborn babes desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." (I Pet. 2:2.) "He sendeth His word and healeth them." (Ps. 107:20.) "Thy words were found," cries Jeremiah, "and I did eat them, and Thy words were unto me a joy and the rejoicing of my heart." (Jer. 15:16.)

Again, those who reject the Scriptures as an absolute and infallible standard of authority seem to confuse that which is absolute and infallible with that which is *arbitrary*. Sabatier, for instance, applies the maxim, *auctoritas valet sine ratione, authority exercises power without reason.* On the contrary, when we say that the Bible is an infallible authority, we base its infallibility on its harmony with right reason. Between the teachings of Scripture and the reason and conscience of man there is a correspondence as between pure air and the lungs. As Coleridge expressed it, "The Bible finds me." "Every one of us," says George Adam Smith, "has within him its echo, its proof, its other self. God's written word is at one with the Revelation He utters within us. Its divine purity and unchangeable Sovereignty are as little to be doubted as those of conscience itself." (George Adam Smith—*The Forgiveness of Sins*—p. 40.) Indeed the word of God is the instrument of the Holy Spirit in enlightening the reason and rectifying the conscience. That word sets a man free, and then feeds and nourishes the freedom it has engendered. The Word of God is not bound and it does not bind. It runs and is glorified in proclaiming release to the captives, recovering of sight to the blind, and liberty to them that are bruised.

Moreover, in order to have an experience *we must have something to experience.* The material of Christian experience is the Word of God, or more particularly Jesus Christ as He is presented in the Scriptures to the soul renewed by the Holy

Spirit. We come to possess the Christ of experience through our knowledge of the Christ of history. By faith we "receive and rest upon Him alone for salvation, *as He is offered to us in the Gospel.*"

It is evident, again, that the validity of authority does not depend on its recognition as such. Authority doesn't cease to be authority either to the man who freely yields obedience, or to him who in the exercise of his moral freedom rejects it. Nor does it cease to be authority because it does not assert its claims by compulsion. The means by which the authority of the Bible is established "are not the instruments of mere force or wonder, always more or less irrelevant in moral teaching, but the declaration of the truth itself, the revelation of the Supreme Being in whose character and actions it is embodied. It is moral truth offering itself upon its own evidence to the conscience of man; at one with conscience, but stronger and more explicit, travelling in the greatness of its strength." (George Adam Smith—*The Forgiveness of Sins*—pp. 42-44-45.)

Again, it seems to me that much confusion has arisen in the discussion of this subject from a failure to note a marked distinction between two meanings of the word "*authority.*" This distinction may be made clear by a simple illustration.

John Smith is a learned lawyer. After practising for several years as an attorney, he is elevated to the bench. Out of his stores of learning and experience, he writes a work on Court Procedure, which becomes a standard treatise, consulted by all lawyers and used as a textbook in the schools of law.

It is evident that John Smith has two kinds of authority. He has authority as a judge, and he has authority as an author. But these are quite different. His authority as judge is external, and must be treated, outwardly at least, with respect and submission. It is an authority backed by force. Contempt of court is a serious offence with uncomfortable consequences. As judge, John Smith may deprive you of a certain measure of your liberty. It is true that you are still free to choose, but under penalty if you choose disobedience and contempt.

His authority as the author of a standard work on a branch of the law is of a different kind. It depends entirely upon the clarity, force, and soundness of his reasoning. It is not an authority that commands obedience by external compulsion, but an authority that commends itself by internal appeal. It in no way abridges freedom, for, on the contrary, it is an appeal to the free judgment of the reader. And yet the attorney who in the exercise of his freedom fails to follow the prescription of this authority in the conduct of his case in court must suffer the consequences for himself and his client.

Though the parallel is not perfect, it may serve to illustrate in some measure the authority of Scripture. Scripture is first of all Jehovah's appeal to reason. Its language is: "I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say." (I Cor. 10:15.) "Let us come near to judgment. . . . Produce your cause, saith Jehovah, bring forth your strong reasons." (Is. 41:1, 21.) "Put me in remembrance, let us plead together, set thou forth thy cause, that thou mayest be justified." (Is. 43:26.) "Come and let us reason together." (Is. 1:18.)

"Where the human mind is concerned," says Dr. James Denney, "it is idle to speak of an authority which can be simply imposed. There neither is nor can be any such thing. The real question is whether there is an authority which can impose itself, which can freely win the recognition and surrender of the mind and heart of man." (James Denney, *Studies in Theology*, pp. 221-222.) The authority of the Bible is of this kind.

It is true that serious consequences follow rejection or neglect of authority in this case as inevitably as in the case of a law of nature, and much more certainly than in violation of the law of the land in these United States. But the fear of penalty falls more and more into the background as the soul, quickened by the Holy Spirit, realises the freedom which the Word of God brings to life in the heart of the believer.

Fear, no doubt, has its place in religion, and to a greater or less degree in the experience of every Christian. But perfect love casteth out fear. The only fear that becomes the Christian heart is, as Augustine says, "the fear that feareth to offend Him whom it loveth." As faith waxes, fear wanes. "Why are ye so fearful, O ye of little faith?"

Whilst there is in Scripture an element of the authority that warns of inevitable penalty in case of disobedience, there is everywhere also that kind of authority which makes its appeal to the reason, the heart, and the sense of right. We see this from the very beginning of God's dealings with our sinful race. To Cain, with his heart full of jealous and revengeful thoughts toward Abel and of rebellious thoughts against God, Jehovah said, "*Why* art thou wroth? And *why* is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door: and unto thee shall be its desire, and do thou rule over it." (Gen. 4:1-8.) It is the voice of authority, but of authority that speaks to the inner man on the basis of reason and conscience. It argues, remonstrates, and appeals.

Speaking broadly, the Word of God consists of the law and the gospel. The authority of the law is *external in its demand;* the authority of the gospel is *internal in its appeal.* But it is not to be forgotten that the gospel preceded the law for fallen man. The lamb was "slain from the foundation of the world." (Rev. 13:8.) The protevangelium, the primeval gospel, was proclaimed in Eden, in the prophetic assurance that the woman's seed should bruise the serpent's head. The Apostle Paul declares that "the Scripture preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham." "The law," says he, "came four hundred and thirty years afterward." And he argues that the law with its threatenings, with its external demand, did not and could not disannul at any time the gospel, so as to make the promise of none effect. This evangelical element of authority, based on the appeal to the heart of man, to reason and the sense of right, never retires into the background. It runs through the Old Testament with its wooing note, growing in the urgency of tenderness as the fulness of gospel times draws near. Through Moses we hear its pleading:—"And now, Israel, what doth Jehovah thy God require of thee, but to fear Jehovah thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve Jehovah thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, to keep the commandments of Jehovah, and his statutes, which I command thee this day for thy good?" (Deut. 10:12-13.)

The prophets take up the appeal. "What doth the Lord require of thee, O man," says Micah, "but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah 6:8.) In Isaiah the solemn pleading becomes more urgent: "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil: learn to do well: seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now and let us reason together, saith Jehovah; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." (Is. 1:16-18.) The Psalmists re-echo it. "O Israel, if thou wouldest hearken unto me! I am Jehovah thy God. Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it." (Ps. 81:8-10.)

Jeremiah speaks of the time when the law written at Sinai on tables of stone should be written on the heart. "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after these days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it." (Jer. 31:31-34.)

The ideal of Christian freedom is not realised, therefore, at Sinai, the Mount that burned with fire, amid earthquake and tempest, and the trumpet's alarum, but only when we come to Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. For, as the Apostle says, Mount Sinai beareth children unto bondage and answereth to the Jerusalem that now is. But the Jerusalem that is above is free, which is our mother. Wherefore brethren we are children not of a bond woman, but of the free. And on this basis he proclaims the ideal of Christian liberty in words never to be forgotten, "For freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled in a yoke of bondage." (Hebrews 12:18-23; Gal. 4:21-5:1.) But even freedom needs a charter and a guide. For freedom is not a static condition. It is a dynamic urge of the soul. Its course should be like that of a mighty river that "glideth at his own sweet will," but within the limits of his banks:

*"Though deep, yet clear*
*Though gentle, yet not dull,*
*Strong without rage,*
*Without o'erflowing full."*

Freedom cannot be driven, but there is no bondage in being led. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Rom. 8:14.) "Lead me in a plain path," cries the Psalmist. (Ps. 27:11.) "For thy name's sake lead me and guide me." (Ps. 31:3.) "Oh send out thy light and thy truth: let them lead me." (Ps. 43:3.) "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." (Ps. 119:105.) "The commandment is a lamp, and the law is light." (Prov. 6:23.) "I have chosen the way of faithfulness; thine ordinances have I set before me. I cleave unto thy testimonies, O Jehovah, put me not to shame. I will run the way of thy commandments when thou shalt enlarge my heart. Teach me, O Jehovah, the way of thy statutes; and I shall keep it unto the end. Give me understanding and I shall observe it with my whole heart. Make me to go in the path of thy commandments, for therein do I delight." (Ps. 119 *passim.*) These are cries that rise from a heart that has tasted the freedom that God's Word brings into the soul, that desires a larger measure of that freedom, and fears that it may forfeit what it has. The Lord Jesus Christ is at once our liberator and the perfect pattern of the Lord's free man and of liberty under law. He found His freedom in submission to the will of God revealed in the Holy Scriptures. The language of His heart was: "Lo, I am come; in the roll of the book it is prescribed unto me: I delight to do thy will, O God; yea, thy law is within my heart." (Ps. 40:7-8; Rev. Ver. Margin.)

He was constantly referring to the will of His Father and to the authority of Scripture, which He came not to destroy but to fulfil in every jot and tittle. "I seek," said He, "not mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." (John 5:30.) "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to accomplish His work." (John 4:34.) "For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." (John 6:38.) "I do always the things that are pleasing to him." (John 8:29.) "I lay down my life that I may take it again. . . . This commandment received I from my Father." (John 10:17-18.) "The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" (John 18:11.) "And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will but what thou wilt." (Mark 14:36.) If these passages do not show that our Lord Jesus Christ submitted his human will to the will of His Father, it is hard to conceive how language could express that idea. And if the submission of one's will to the revealed will of another is not to recognise the authority of that revealed will, it would be hard to define such submission. Sabatier's fallacy lies in assuming that authority which meets with willing obedience ceases to be authority. From this premise he reaches the conclusion that because the ideal of Christianity is the willing acceptance of God's will, which is a thing of the Spirit, therefore Christianity is a religion of the Spirit and cannot be at the same time a religion of authority. It seems perfectly evident, on the contrary, that there is no conflict between the reality of authority and the spirit of cheerful submission thereto. Therefore there is no incongruity in regarding Christianity as a religion of authority and a religion of the Spirit.

The Apostle in writing to the church at Rome says something that is very pertinent to this subject. "Know ye not," says he, "that to whom ye present yourselves as bond-servants, his bond-servants ye are whom ye obey. . . . But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered." (Rom. 6:16-17.)

The figure is that of a bond-servant, a slave, under the authority of his master. In the gospel the soul of man is taken by God's grace from under the hands of one master to be put into the hands of another. But such is the character of God's grace and service that the transfer is, as the Apostle says, *a deliverance*, and the renewed man obeys from the heart the will of his new Master. In His service he finds his perfect freedom. He has been made willing in the day of God's power through redeeming grace. Christian freedom is freedom within and under the authority of the Scriptures, the freedom of an enlarged heart that runs the way of God's commandments. It is for this the Psalmist prays when he cries, "Uphold me with a willing spirit." (Ps. 51:12.) To act freely, in the highest sense, is to act in accordance with one's original nature and to fulfil the purpose for which one was created. So far as one fails of this, bondage has taken the place of freedom. Some foreign force has intervened to obstruct or pervert. Man's true nature and chief end is to glorify God by obedience to His revealed will, and thus enjoy Him forever. His service alone is perfect freedom. Thus it appears that spiritual freedom and the glad acceptance of our Heavenly Father's will are one and the same thing. As that will is made known in the Scriptures, is it not evident that the Christian finds his true freedom, his normal and original liberty, within and under the authority of the Scriptures, and that it is to be found nowhere else? "I shall walk at liberty, for I have sought thy precepts." (Ps. 119:45.)

This view of freedom within and under the authority the Scriptures suggests the questions: In what respects is the Bible an infallible authority? How is it to be used by the Lord's freeman as a perfect guide to truth and duty?

According to the standards of the Reformed Faith the Bible is the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. All Scripture is inspired of God, "breathed into by God, and breathing out God to every devout reader," as Dr. B. B. Warfield has said. (*The Inspiration of the Bible*, p. 31.) To what end and for what purpose has it been given to man as the inspired and infallible word of God? Its own answer is that it may be "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." (II Tim. 3:16.) In short, its purpose as the inspired word of God is *practical*, that the Lord's freeman may have a manual of Christian faith and duty. As the Shorter Catechism has it, "The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requireth of man." This defines their scope, and implies that matters aside from religious faith and practice are dealt with only incidentally, and in so far only as these matters are essential to the understanding of their main purpose.

Many of the most competent scholars, whose learning, honesty, and Christian devotion cannot be questioned, hold that the inspiration of the Scriptures as an infallible rule of faith and duty does not necessarily imply freedom from errors in matters that are incidental and aside from the main scope and purpose.

Whatever we may think of the views of these devout scholars, whether to us their position seems perilous or not, logical or illogical, consistent or inconsistent, we must recognise that scholars as great in reverence and humility as they are in scholarship find it not only possible but, in their view of the facts, *necessary*, to distinguish between inspiration and inerrancy, between infallibility in religious truth and inerrancy in those secular matters that constitute the drapery and wrappings of that truth.

Perhaps most of us have been taught and have grown up to believe that the Bible is not only infallible in its moral and spiritual teachings, but that it is also without error or inaccuracy in any of its statements whatsoever. Some of us may even go so far as to say, *falsus in uno falsus in omnibus*, that it is either "all or nothing," that if the writers of Scripture should be found mistaken or inaccurate in matters of history, science, etc., the Bible would be vitiated as an infallible guide in matters religious and moral.

That staunch defender of evangelical orthodoxy, Dr. Francis L. Patton, uttered a timely warning on this subjest in the lectures delivered from this platform five years ago:—"There is a disposition on the part of some, apparently, to show that unless the Bible is inerrantly accurate in everything you cannot trust it in anything. There are those who seem to say that the order of man's thought must first be the inspired Bible and secondly the Divine Christ. To that position I cannot assent; I am unable to make the *in terrorem* argument that unless you believe in the inerrancy of the Bible you have no right to believe in Christ. . . . Moreover a mere fallacious argument could not be used than that which is sometimes employed in a misuse of the legal maxim, *Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*. How much history could stand that test? The real question is whether the Bible is true, not whether it is inspired. Must a book on every subject be inspired in order to be true? Have we lost all faith in inductive logic? Have we abandoned human testimony as a source of information? Is there no longer a place for common sense of mankind?" (*Fundamental Christianity*, pp. 146-147.)

And again Dr. Patton writes: "Conceding now the inspiration of Scripture you cannot on that account assume that it is errorless. You may say that being inspired it is fair to expect that it will be preserved from error, but this is not evidence. We are accustomed in support of inspiration of the Bible to cite its accuracy; inspired, let us say, because errorless. It is a different thing, however, to say errorless because inspired. To say that the Bible is trustworthy because of its accuracy is by implication to say that we have the right and power to discern between truth and error. You cannot license Reason to seek truth and deny her right to see error. And it is a hazardous thing to say that being inspired the Bible must be free from error: for the discovery of a single error would destroy its inspiration. Nor have we the right to substitute the word 'inerrancy' for 'inspiration' in our discussion of the Bible unless we are prepared to show from the teaching of the Bible that inspiration means inerrancy, and that, I think, would be a difficult thing to do. With the deepest reverence for the Scriptures as the inspired word of God, I am nevertheless bound to say that differences of opinion on this point must be allowed to exist, as they have always existed, among Christians." (*Fundamental Christianity*—pp. 163-164.)

To say that such inaccuracies and discrepancies as exist in the Bible as we have it did not occur in the original autographs is a mere assumption. However plausible the assumption, it is based on the *a priori* theory that inspiration necessarily implies inerrancy. We are not in possession now, and it is practically certain that we shall never be in possession, of the original autograph of any part of the Bible. That there are errors and inaccuracies in the Bible, as we have it, in those incidental matters that constitute the wrappings of its precious treasure of spiritual truth, is held not only by "modernists" but by many strict and orthodox "fundamentalists." Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, protagonist of "fundamentalism" against "modernism" in a recent controversy, says, "When I said the Bible was an infallible guide, I meant infallible as a spiritual guide." Commenting on the discrepancy in the numbers slain in a battle as given in Kings and Chronicles, he says, "I cannot make my regard for the Bible rest on whether ten thousand or a hundred thousand were slain. The whole matter is irrelevant." Speaking of the different accounts in Matthew and the Acts as to Judas and the field of blood, and the quotation from Zechariah which in Matthew 27:9 is attributed to Jeremiah, Dr. Macartney says: "I wish you to understand, sir, that should you prove conclusively that Matthew and Luke differ as to the history of Judas and that field of blood, you do not shake my faith in the Bible as my guide in Christian truth. Not the end of Judas, but the death of Christ, that is the main thing. If Matthew said Jeremiah instead of Zechariah, I'm not troubled in the least." (Clarence E. Macartney, *Christianity and Common Sense*, pp. 232-233. Quoted by James H. Snowden, *Old Faith and New Knowledge*, pp. 104-105.)

Dr. Charles Hodge wrote long before this question had become as acute as it is today: "Apparent discrepancies, although numerous, are for the most part trivial. No sane man would deny that the Parthenon was built of marble, even if here and there a speck of sandstone should be detected in its structure. Not less unreasonable is it to deny the inspiration of such a book as the Bible, because one writer says that on a given occasion twenty-four, and another says that twenty-three thousand were slain." (Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I, p. 170.)

The late Dr. James Denney of the United Free Church College, Glasgow, says as to the question of errancy or inerrancy in the gospels: "The *gospels* have every quality which they need, to put us in contact with *the gospel*; they do put us in contact with it, and the Spirit makes it sure to our faith; why should we ask for more from them? If they truly represent Christ to us, so that we gain the faith in Him which their authors had, is not that all we can desire? The evangelists may make mistakes in dates, in the order of events, in reporting the occasion of a word of Jesus, possibly in the application of a parable. . . . We may differ—Christian men do differ—about numberless questions of this kind; but we ought to be able to say boldly that even though in any number of cases of this kind the *gospels* should be proved in error, the *gospel* is untouched; the word of God, the revelation of God to the soul of Christ, attested by the Spirit, lives and abides. Revelation is ultimately personal, as personal as faith. It is to Christ we give our trust, and as long as the gospels make us sure of what He is, they serve God's purpose and our need." (James Denney, *Studies in Theology*, pp. 208-209.)

The position taken by these reverent and conservative scholars, instead of disturbing our faith in view of errors and inaccuracies that have been or may be pointed out in the Bible in regard to matters unessential to the revelation of God through Christ in the Scriptures, should give us a quiet confidence in the midst of the controversies of the day,—a "central peace subsisting at the heart of endless agitation."

*"How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,*
*Is laid for your faith in his excellent Word:*
*What more can he say than to you He hath said,*
*To you who for refuge to Jesus have fled?"*

I have called your attention to the distinction between infallibility and inerrancy, not to argue for or against the inerrancy of the Scriptures. I have introduced it for its practical importance in at least three relations:—in relation to your own faith in the Word of God, in relation to the faith of those who in your ministry will look to you for guidance, and in your relation as presbyters sitting in the Church Courts.

It may be that some of you are disturbed, as I confess I was for years, by suggestions of discrepancies and inaccuracies in the Bible. But suppose, as Dr. Denney says, that "in any number of cases of this kind" the Bible "should be proved to be in error," yet "the Word of God, the revelation of God to the soul in Christ attested by the Spirit lives and abides. Revelation is ultimately personal, as personal as faith." If it is personal with me, so that in the Bible as the revelation of salvation through Christ I hear God speaking to me, I can say with Dr. Macartney, "If Matthew said Jeremiah instead of Zechariah, I'm not troubled in the least." It does not seem to be God's way to reveal supernaturally and infallibly what man can discover for himself. Could not Matthew, if indeed he wrote *Jeremiah* for *Zechariah*, have ascertained, in the exercise of his own faculties, whether the words quoted were from Jeremiah or Zechariah? But he could never have discovered through natural means the good news of salvation through Jesus Christ. Flesh and blood did not reveal this to him, but the Father in heaven. Does not Luke in the introduction to his gospel seem to recognise that accuracy in regard to historical facts depends on careful investigation of natural sources? (Luke 1:1-4.) May not this principle have a wide application to the Scriptures in general? Is it not in the unique spiritual character and power of the Bible rather than in its literal accuracy that we find its inspiration?

In my relation as pastor and teacher to those who look to me for guidance, I would spend little time on the question of errancy or inerrancy. I would try to lead the perplexed and troubled soul in the way in which God has led thousands of humble souls, to find Christ in the Scriptures and in their own hearts "from the inward working of the Holy Spirit, hearing witness by and with the Word." (*Westminster Confession of Faith,* Chap. I—Par. V.) "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." If we find this testimony in the spirit of Scripture, difficulties of the letter will be relatively unimportant.

But this question may become one of serious moment to you in your responsibility as presbyters. The Constitution of the Church places upon you along with your brethren sitting in the ecclesiastical courts, the duty "to maintain truth and righteousness, condemning erroneous opinions and practices." (*Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.* par. 62.)

"Heresy and schism may be of such a nature as to warrant deposition (of a minister); but errors ought to be carefully considered, whether they strike at the vitals of religion, and are industriously spread, or whether they arise from the weakness of the human understanding, and are not likely to do much injury." (*Rules of Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.* par. 200.)

It is not impossible that you may have to consider, as presbyters in the Courts of the Church, charges of heresy preferred against some fellow-presbyter on the ground of his views touching the inspiration of the Scriptures, which is certainly one of the vital doctrines of our religion.

An overture came up to the General Assembly of 1928, asking for a doctrinal deliverance on evolution and inspiration, as to whether a minister, holding the theory of evolution and denying the plenary or verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, could remain as a minister in our Church. The overture had as its preamble the words: "In view of the clear and full statements of our standards as to the plenary or verbal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures as originally given in the original languages, etc."

In a review of the work of the Assembly, Dr. Walter L. Lingle says: "That statement seems to make 'plenary (full) inspiration' and 'verbal inspiration' synonymous terms. I do not so understand them. This statement also declares that the Confession of Faith teaches clearly the doctrine of 'verbal inspiration.' The Confession does teach clearly the great fact of inspiration, but if you will search its pages again you will probably be convinced that, while it does not deny the doctrine of verbal inspiration, it does not teach it. In fact, it teaches the great fact of inspiration with power, but you will probably end your study of the Confession with the conclusion that the Confession does not commit itself to any theory of inspiration." (Walter L. Lingle—*The Union Seminary Review*—*July* 1928, pp. 383-384.)

The statement has been made that "no church has formulated an official definition and doctrine of inspiration and incorporated it in its creed." Bishop Gore in his work on *The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, says: "The Church never attempted to *define* inspiration" and "never showed any disposition to define the scope of inspiration; and we cannot but feel that a very real movement of the Holy Spirit is apparent in the history of the ancient church, guiding it in what it did define and in what it abstained from defining." (James H. Snowden—*Old Faith and New Knowledge*, pp. 100, 105.)

In view of all this what course would you take as presbyters if a minister should be charged with heresy on the ground that he does not hold the Bible to be inerrant in every statement that it makes? Or how would you vote in the General Assembly on the answer to be given to such an overture as the one quoted above? I ask these questions, not to attempt to answer them for you, but that you may clearly see that it is not a theory, but a very practical matter that confronts you, in this whole question of *Freedom and the Scriptures*. This is only one of its acute phases. The indications are that your ministry will be exercised in a period of almost unexampled agitation and controversy touching the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures. For the sake of your own faith and that of those who hear you, and that you may meet your responsibilities as presbyters in the courts of the church, you should give thoughtful heed to these things.

Before we leave the question of alleged or possible errors in the Bible in matters of history, science, etc., several things should be said. 1. None of the alleged errors affect the religious teachings of Scripture. As Dr. Hodge says: "Apparent discrepancies, although numerous, are for the most part trivial." 2. Many statements in the Bible that were supposed to have been erroneous have been shown by further investigation to be true. This is notably the case in the record of many historical events. As, for instance, the mention of Sargon II as a king of Assyria in Isaiah 20, and of Belshazzar as Chaldean king in Daniel 5, and in the New Testament the once contraverted statement in Luke 2:2 of the world-census "made when Quirinius was governor of Syria." 3. As to alleged errors in matters of science, it is to be remembered that the Bible is a practical book for guidance in faith and duty. It speaks of the phenomena of nature either in the figurative language of poetry, or in popular terms, according to the appearances of things, as writers on practical subjects with no purpose to teach science do today. If the Bible had used the technical language of science it would not have been understood by its contemporaneous readers and by comparatively few today.

If it had undertaken scientific expositions it would have been a library and not a compact book. Moreover it would have forestalled scientific discovery, which God in His goodness left for man. "The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that take pleasure therein." It pleased God to reveal the truth of natural science through Copernicus, Newton, Darwin, Faraday, Edison, Einstein, and others, men whom He girded and endowed for this purpose. If Scripture had undertaken to speak in accurate scientific terms of natural phenomena it would have been necessary to speak in terms of the final science, which man has not yet attained. The terminology of science has undergone many changes in our own generation, and is being altered and added to with bewildering rapidity in these latter years. The science of today is not the science of yesterday, nor of tomorrow. With all this, is it not remarkable that the order of creation in the first chapter of Genesis is in its general outline the order confirmed by modern science, and that it is the only cosmogony that has come down to us from very ancient times that is free from puerilities and absurdities?

Taking these considerations together, so far from militating against, they powerfully confirm, the claim which the Scriptures make for themselves as "given by inspiration of God," that they may be "profitable for teaching," etc.

"I should not hesitate to say," writes Dr. Denney, "that the man who cannot hear God speak to him in the story of creation and the fall will never hear God's voice anywhere. But that does not make the first chapter of Genesis science, nor the third chapter history. And what is of authority in these chapters is not the quasi-scientific or quasi-historical form, but the message, which through them comes to the heart, of God's creative wisdom and power, of man's native kinship to God, of his calling to rule over nature, of his sin, of God's judgment and mercy. It is the contents of this message also which we use, without misgiving, in constructing our theology, for these contents are authenticated by the witness of the Spirit. To quote the Westminster Confession, 'The Supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture'—not the mere letter of the Scripture itself." (James Denney, *Studies in Theology*, p. 219.)

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, speaking of the creation story as given in the tablets of Babylonia, says: "When one turns from this welter of mythology to the first chapter of Genesis, with its stately and glorious exordium, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,' one feels as though he had left the miasmic marshes for a high mountain with clean air to breathe and great horizons to look upon. . . . The only way in which to feel the force of this is to read the documents. See if you do not come from the old Semitic heritage to the Biblical account as Stade came from the so-called Eden story of Babylonia to the Eden story of the Scripture, saying that it was like passing from the slough of a village cesspool to a clean mountain spring." (Harry Emerson Fosdick, *The Modern Use of the Bible*, pp. 52-53.) The head of a scientific department of a great American University said to me not long ago, "There is no way to account for the first chapter of Genesis except that it came by Divine inspiration."

How, then, are we to regard and use the Scriptures, that they may be profitable to the man of

God, completely furnishing him for every good work?

Is it not evident that they are not to be regarded as an authoritative textbook in any branch of secular knowledge? John Calvin, in commenting on the account of the creation of the heavenly bodies in Genesis 1:14-16, says, "Moses does not speak with philosophical acuteness . . . but relates those things which are everywhere observed, even by the uncultured. . . . He who would learn astronomy, let him go elsewhere."

Dr. Daniel Lamont quotes Dr. Samuel Johnson as saying that "ideas must be expressed in some form." "Accordingly," says Dr. Lamont, "even eternal truth, if it is to be conveyed into the human mind must be conveyed thither by a vehicle which is capable of entering the gates of the mind. It happens often, unfortunately, that the form in which an idea is expressed is elevated to the same rank as an idea itself. Thus, when the Bible declares in its opening chapter, that all things are of God, it must use some form for the impressive and memorable conveyance of that truth, and the form which is naturally the one which was most level to the understanding of the age to which the preliminary truth was first declared. But it has happened all too often that the temporary form has been taken for the vital thing, with the result that the elemental truth which the chapter is obviously designed to teach, namely the fact of God, is thrust into the background. And so there are many who to this day suppose that the writer of the first chapter of Genesis had for his motive our scientific enlightenment. The vehicle has been taken to be everything and its load nothing. That is intellectual tragedy. Had the inspired writer been brought up with his immediate circle of readers in our intellectual forms, he would no doubt have used such terms as evolution, atoms, electrons, ether, light-years, and so forth, and the lesson would have still been the same: *It is God that created*. But how glad we should be that the Bible uses the forms it does! Our modern forms would be out of date in a generation." (Daniel Lamont, *The Church and the Creeds*, pp. 133-134.)

Nor is the Bible to be regarded as a book of precise rules in matters of faith and duty. Texts are not to be used after the manner of a rubber stamp, to be applied mechanically and with little discrimination. The Scriptures were not intended to act with the precision of an adding machine. They are not a guide to the Christian pilgrim's progress through the world in the way that an automobile map is a guide to the tourist. The map shows just what road to take at the parting of the ways. There is no act of judgment, much less of conscience, required. There is no difficulty of interpretation or of application. But in details of faith and practice there are few questions which the Scriptures answer categorically. If they did there would be very little moral discipline involved. A concordance could be so arranged as to catalogue alphabetically all questions of faith and duty with references to the answers by chapter and verse. Duties might be defined after the manner of a dictionary, and prescribed after the fashion of Mrs. Rorer's cook-book or Squibbs' chemical formulary. How much trouble this would save!

How much occasion for controversy avoided! There would be no difficulties either of interpretation or application. There would be no room for doctrinal differences, as between Athanasius and Arius, or Augustine and Pelagius, or Calvin and Arminius.

And as in doctrine, so in ethics, the way would be clear. There would be no cases of conscience and no room for the Christian casuist. It has been very truly said that duties never conflict. But conceptions of where duty lies in particular cases do often conflict. The roads are not numbered nor marked with guide-posts for conscience as they are for motor-cars.

The Bible is a book of principles rather than of rules. A wise father will give his growing son, and more and more as he grows, principles of right conduct, leaving the boy to interpret and apply the principles to details of conduct as occasion may require. Mistakes will be made. But if the boy accepts the principles, he will learn more by his mistakes than he would by conformity to hard and fast rules. The moral discipline involved in the exercise of his own judgment and conscience, and in making his own decisions, will be worth far more to him than even infallible guidance along a path prescribed at every turn and in every detail by his father. This seems to be the way of our Heavenly Father with us, His children.

There are some who take the position that the Scriptures cannot be an infallible guide, because to guide infallibly there must be an infallible reader. But this is a palpable *non-sequitur*. The infallibility of a perfectly accurate automobile map would not be destroyed by the failure of a motorist to read it correctly. Its accuracy as a general guide to motorists would not be affected by his inaccuracy or carelessness as reader or interpreter.

This much is clear, however, that just because the guidance the Bible gives is not like that of a map, no mere man has ever found in it infallible guidance in every detail of faith and duty. The guiding principles are there, and are infallible principles. But principles must be interpreted and applied by the reason and the moral nature. And no man has perfect moral vision. We have our prejudices, our preconceived theories, our personal desires and preferences, which blind or mislead.

Only the perfect man, Christ Jesus, found in the whole round of life perfect and infallible guidance in the infallible book. He alone had perfect insight into its meaning and a will perfectly conformed to its teaching. "If any man willeth to do His will," said He, "he shall know of the teaching." Our spiritual insight into the principles of revelation will be measured by our spirit of obedience to the will of God. And our spiritual insight is our only organ for understanding the infallible word.

But vision and insight need to be quickened and cleared by the power of the Holy Spirit, who has been given to guide us into all the truth. The Christian of clearest vision and deepest insight is the Christian who most fervently prays, "Open Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law. Make me to understand the way of Thy precepts, so shall I meditate on Thy wondrous works." (Ps. 119:18-27.)

# II

# THE SPIRIT AND THE LETTER

IN the last lecture I tried to show that Christianity is a religion of authority and at the same time the religion of the spirit. For the true antithesis is not between the spirit and authority, as Sabatier conceives it, but between the spirit and the letter. It is the spirit that quickeneth; the letter brings bondage and death.

I was in Paris in the fall of 1896 and witnessed a remarkable sight. The Emperor and Empress of Russia had come to visit the French Capital. The city was in gala attire. It was in the fall of the year when the trees were bare, but the Parisians, with their love of beauty, and their skill in creating the beauty that they loved, had adorned the naked trees with artificial flowers of glowing colours and exquisite shades of colour. The Champs Élyseés burgeoned out of season and in defiance of Nature, as if Oberon and Titania had conspired with the people of Paris to reverse the seasons and to welcome warmly their royal guests in spite of the chill that was in the air. But in all this beauty there was one thing wanting. The spirit of life was not there. There was no vital connection between flower and branch. "Blossom and blossom, and promise of blossom, but never a fruit."

So it is with a religion of the letter. It may appear well; it may make esthetic appeal. But it is devoid of life. Only the religion of the spirit can quicken into fruitfulness. The Apostle Paul contrasts the "*works*" of the flesh with the "*fruit*" of the spirit, and there is a significance in the change of word from "works" to "fruit," and also in the change of number from the plural to the singular. (Gal. 5:19-22.) "Works" suggests that which is mechanical and dead,—"dead works" they are called in Hebrews 9:14, and "unfruitful works" in Ephesians 5:11. "Fruit" is suggestive of life. The products of a machine are separate and independent entities,—they are "works." The products of a living tree though manifold in number, are vitally one,—they are "fruit." The olives on each twig and branch partake of the root and fatness of the olive tree and are *one* in a common life.

God's people are likened to "trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord." (Is. 61:3.) "The trees of the Lord," says the Psalmist, "are full of sap." (Ps. 104:16.) The sap that feeds the tree and makes it fruitful is the Word of God. It is the man who delights in God's Word and meditates therein day and night that is likened to a tree planted by the rivers of water that bringeth forth his fruit in his season. That it may produce the fruit of the Spirit, the Word is to be interpreted and applied in the spirit and not in the letter. "And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." "No prophecy of Scripture is of private (or *special* R. V. margin) interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." (II Pet.

1:20.) Which seems to mean that as the Word of God came by the Holy Spirit, and not in any case by the will of the man through whom the Spirit spoke, so the right interpretation of the Word is from the same Spirit, and is dependent upon His illuminating grace. It is not an exclusively private or monopolistic possession or function of any man or ecclesiastical organisation. This is in accord with the words of the Apostle John, addressed not to officials of the church but to believers in general: "Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things. . . . The anointing which ye received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you. . . . and even as it taught you, ye abide in Him." (I John 2:20-27.)

This does not mean that we cannot learn from one another; for the truth is something we are to "comprehend with all saints." But it does mean that the supreme and only indispensable qualification for the spiritual interpretation and appropriation of the Scriptures is abiding in Christ and receiving constantly from Him the anointing of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly it is not an uncommon thing to find in some humble cottage an isolated and comparatively unlettered Christian with a spiritual apprehension and appropriation of the Word of God to which great scholars and learned critics who abide in the letter and get no farther than dictionary and grammar can take them, are strangers. The things of the Spirit are "spiritually discerned." The humble and unlettered Christian may stumble and make mistakes in the literal interpretation of a passage of Scripture because of his ignorance of the laws of hermeneutics and the niceties of exegesis, and may, notwithstanding, get the spiritual drift of the passage and hear the voice of God speaking to his soul. All of which is lost on the learned literalist. This is not said in disparagement of scholarship in the interpretation of Scripture. The trained exegete who is at the same time an humble and spiritually minded Christian will profit much every way by his learning.

John Oman warns us that we may hold such a doctrine of plenary inspiration as will only serve to petrify the whole body of Holy Writ. (*The Problem of Faith and Freedom*, p. 285.) The very doctrine of Scripture as to its own inspiration may be held in bondage to the letter, in a way to blind us to the spiritual meaning of Scripture.

This is signally illustrated very early in the history of the Church. "In the century succeeding Paul," says Dr. Ernest F. Scott, "the Gospel was construed as a *nova lex*, similar in its demand and character to the Law of Moses; and the whole system, against which Paul made his protest, was established again in the Catholic Church. Luther rediscovered the central Pauline idea; but in Protestantism also the religion of the letter, of submission to some outward yoke of bondage, has never ceased to maintain itself over against the religion of the Spirit. The Judaism which was the ultimate object of Paul's attack, had its ground in certain permanent tendencies of human nature; and, for this reason if for no other, the Epistles are of lasting significance and value. A time will never be in which it will not be necessary to fight Paul's battle over again, and the Christian apologete must go back to Paul for his truest guidance and inspiration." (Ernest F. Scott, *Apologetic of the New Testament*, p. 102—Quoted by W. M. Macgregor, *Christian Freedom*, p. 43.)

In the same strain Archdeacon Farrar declares that "Judaism was something more than a dead system; it is a living tendency. There is a Judaism in the secret heart of every one of us, of which we must beware." (F. W. Farrar, *The Messages of the Books*, p. 254.)

We are ever prone to forget that the letter killeth. "A living dog is better than a dead lion." May it not be that a living heresy is better than a dead orthodoxy? For a living heresy, if earnest and sincere, may at least stumble on the truth. But a dead orthodoxy, put to death by the letter, cannot move a step toward vital and vitalising truth unless there should be wrought upon it the miracle of a resurrection from the dead.

Karl Barth, leader of the great revival of Calvinism in Europe, speaks of a time in the Reformed Church when doctrine parted from its life-giving origin and hardened into orthodoxy. (*Word of God and Word of Man*, p. 246.) This is, indeed, a perennial peril. If a formal orthodoxy becomes but a dead hand, the dead hand of the past at the throat of the living present, we may, without discounting the value of creedal statements, assent to the poet's words:

> *"There is more truth in honest doubt, believe me,*
> *Than in half their creeds."*

"It is better to go to the judgment after a lifetime of manful struggling with the truth, albeit with some errors," said a great teacher of theology, "than to go there with whatever amount of truth held in mere languid receptivity." (Dr. Nathaniel Taylor, Dr. Nathaniel J. Burton's *Yale Lectures*, p. 50.)

Did not Christ send blind and self-complacent orthodoxy to heterdoxy's school when he bade the lawyer, sound as he was in the letter of the law, go to the Good Samaritan and learn of him? It was not Jewish orthodoxy as such that he disparaged, for He had said to the Samaritan woman at the well, "Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know; for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers." (John 4:22-24.) In these words He commended, and aligned Himself with, those who are orthodox, not after the deadness of the letter, however, but in spirit and in truth.

Paul in like manner sends the orthodox circumcisionist, who knows the law only in the letter, to learn of the unorthodox uncircumcisionist who, though violating or ignoring the letter of the law, observes its spirit; for, says he, in effect, "the truly orthodox man (the Jew) is not one who is orthodox outwardly but inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." (Romans 2:25-29.)

There is such a thing, says Dr. John A. Hutton, as "being more orthodox than it is orthodox to be." This is the case where we exalt orthodoxy in the letter above the free and spiritual apprehension of the truth which transcends the letter of the Word.

We need to remind ourselves again and again that the Bible is a book not of exact and exacting rules, but of living principles. Rules must be received and obeyed in the letter; principles can be understood and used for guidance only in the spirit. It is more difficult to walk by principle than by rule, by the spirit than by the letter; but at the same time it is more educative and ennobling. Rules are for slaves, principles for free men. Children may be governed by rules; full grown sons have graduated from the leading-strings of the nursery into self-guidance out-of-doors, under the open heaven and in God's free air. (Gal. 4:1-7; Col. 2:20-23.) Rules are condensed milk for babes; principles are strong meat for men.

The Bible is, in one aspect at least, an inspired *record*—the writers were guided by the Spirit of God as to what to include in this record and what to leave out. But the meaning of the record, the spiritual lessons to be drawn from it by the reader —this is a very different matter. These lessons cannot be determined in a mathematical way, by rule of thumb or rule of three. They cannot be extracted from the record after the manner of finding the cube-root. They are not geometric formulae, after the pattern of the *pons asinorum*, by which you may find with absolute accuracy the square of the hypotheneuse of a right-angle triangle by adding together the squares of the other two sides.

There would be no moral training in such a process. There could be no spiritual growth to a soul fed on such dry and sapless pabulum.

There is difficulty, and corresponding danger, in the fact that we must interpret the inspired record of Scripture for ourselves—we must find and disentangle the principles that lie half-hidden in biography and history, in psalm and prophecy, in allegory and parable.

The record has opposite kinds of lessons, often lying side by side, and frequently hard to differentiate. In the recorded lives of patriarchs, and prophets, and apostles, there are things to be avoided as well as things to be imitated. When a certain Samaritan village refused hospitality, James and John, who with Peter constituted the inner circle, asked if they might not call down fire from heaven to consume the inhabitants, after the example of Elijah. But the Master rebuked them, saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

A Presbyterian minister of my acquaintance had resigned his pastorate, ceased preaching, and was on the point of demitting the ministry on two grounds. First, that he could no longer subscribe to a doctrine of inspiration that seemed to him to involve necessarily the inerrancy of Scripture in matters of science, history, etc. Second, that he could not reconcile the doctrine that the Scriptures are an infallible rule of faith and life with such expressions as occur in the imprecatory Psalms and elsewhere. He feared that his views on these points were not consistent with his ordination vows.

A brother minister pointed out to him that, whatever might be the truth as to the errancy or inerrancy of Scripture in secular matters, he had at his ordination subscribed only to their infallibility as a guide to faith and life, "what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requireth of man." And as to his second difficulty, the presence of the imprecatory Psalms in the Bible, he was asked if he had ever felt called on to use them on anyone, or whether he thought he would be justified in so doing. He answered in the negative. Why not put them, then, in the category with Elijah's fire from heaven and Elisha's she-bears out of the wood, which, whatever may have been their place and function under another dispensation, are not consonant with the spirit of the gospel which the Christian minister is commissioned to proclaim. He was then asked whether he would hesitate to accept as infallibly true and binding any clear teaching of Scripture as to religious faith or moral conduct, to which he replied, "Certainly not."

It was to the credit of this perplexed minister that he did not wish to continue his ministry under false pretenses. And was it not to his credit that he did not allow difficulties which he came to see were not inconsistent with the declaration he made at ordination, and had no practical bearing on his faith in and proclamation of the Word of God as the only infallible guide in matters of faith and practice, to turn him aside from the preaching of the everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ?

Today he is preaching with a larger measure of enthusiasm and effectiveness that ever before in his ministry of more than thirty years.

Need of discrimination in drawing lessons from the inspired record might be illustrated from many passages. Take for instance the Song of Deborah and Barak, the son of Abinoam, on the day of Sisera's defeat and death. The part played by Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, is praised and memorialised. The circumstances were these:—Sisera, captain of King Jabin's army, had fled on foot to the tent of Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite: "for there was peace between Jabin the King of Hazor and the house of Heber the Kenite. And Jael went out to meet Sisera, and said unto him, Turn in, my lord, turn in to me; fear not. And he turned into the tent, and she covered him with a rug. . . . Then Jael, Heber's wife, took a tent-pin, and took a hammer in her hand and went softly unto him and smote the pin into his temples; and it pierced through into the ground; for he was in a deep sleep; and he swooned and died."

In the Song of Deborah and Barak we read: "Blessed above women shall Jael be, the wife of Heber the Kenite; Blessed shall she be above women in the tent." And the Song proceeds to praise what she did in the tent. Is there no need of discrimination between the spirit and the letter in interpreting a passage like this? Is Jael's conduct to be held up as worthy of imitation by our children? Was she not guilty of deceit and treachery and barbaric cruelty?

But interpreting the passage after the spirit and not after the letter, we may find that the inspired record, which does not necessarily approve of all that it records, contains lessons that are profitable to the man of God "for teaching, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness"—such lessons as these:

1. That it is not fair to weigh in the scales of a later age the conduct of one brought up in the atmosphere and environment described in the Book of Judges. It can hardly be expected that one's standards should be wholly independent of the moral standards of one's time. We are to judge men of former generations by the standards that prevailed in their times, as we may hope to be judged by those who in future generations will wonder at many of the moral standards that prevail today, which under God's educational discipline will be superseded by better things. As revelation is progressive, so also are the moral standards of the people to whom it is given.

2. The Kenites had allied themselves with Israel and were worshippers of Jehovah, as we learn in other passages. Israel's cause represented the cause of the God of Israel, to whose service they had voluntarily attached themselves. Jael, with all her false standards, and misinterpretations perhaps of truer standards, was moved by a spirit of loyalty to a holy cause. In so far as she acted in that spirit she is worthy of praise and imitation to the end of time, however reprehensible and unworthy of imitation she may have been in the letter of her conduct. (Judges—Chaps. 4 and 5.)

The same discrimination must be exercised in studying the lives and conduct of those Old Testament characters whose names have been enrolled in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews as heroes and exemplars of the faith that is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,"—of Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, of Moses, Joshua, and Rahab the harlot, of Barak, Samson, and Jephthah, of David, and Samuel, and the prophets. All these are to be judged in the light of the days in which they lived, remembering, as the inspired recorder of their works of faith tells us, that "God has provided better things for us," (Heb. 11:40) and that we shall be judged in the light of the better things of a better dispensation.

The same discernment of spirit and letter is needed in considering the examples of New Testament saints, of the Apostles both before and after Pentecost; of those sons of thunder, James and John, of impetuous Peter and doubting Thomas; of Paul and Barnabas in their dissension over John Mark,—(which was right? or how far was each right or wrong?) and the inconsistency of Peter for which Paul rebuked him to his face at Antioch.

How much better for our moral discipline and for the exercise of all our faculties that the Bible is a book of living principles and not of mechanical rules, and that to so large a degree these living principles are embedded in narratives and stories of surpassing human interest, from which they must be deduced by earnest and prayerful study under the guidance of the Spirit of all truth.

Perhaps in regard to no part of Scripture is interpretation in the spirit rather than after the letter more needed than in regard to the sayings of Jesus Christ our Lord. Indeed he seems to have chosen a manner of speech and a style of teaching which necessitates spiritual rather than literal handling for right interpretation. He was constantly misunderstood, even by the twelve, as he is today by twelves of thousands who never get beyond the letter of his sayings.

Take for example the Master's warning, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." He had just had a controversy with certain representatives of these sects who had demanded of Him a sign from heaven. He declined to give them any other signs than those they already had. And he left them and departed to the other side of the lake. But the disciples because they had forgotten to take bread became stalled in the letter of His words, and missed the spiritual lesson that it was not the leaven of bread, but the leaven of the false teaching of Pharisees and Sadducees, against which they were warned. (Matt. 16:1-12; Mark 8:11-21.)

So it was, too, when He spoke of His flesh which He would give for the life of the world. "The Jews strove among themselves saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Jesus therefore said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in yourselves. . . . Many of his disciples when they heard this, said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" But Jesus said unto them: "It is the Spirit that giveth life; the *flesh* (Did He mean the literal eating of His flesh, if that were possible?) profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life. . . . Upon this many of his disciples went back and walked no more with Him. Jesus said therefore unto the twelve, Would ye also go away?" Then it was that Simon Peter, catching up the Master's saying in regard to "spirit and life," which he doubtless did not fully understand, answered out of a loving, trustful heart, "Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life?" (John 6:52-69.)

Are there not thousands today who in their view of the Lord's Supper abide in the letter of the Lord's words, "This is my body," "This is my blood of the covenant"? (Mark 14:22-25.) And even among those who have gotten beyond the crude notion of a material change of substance, are there not many who fail to discern and appropriate "the spirit and life" in the Sacrament of His death? Protestants as well as Romanists are in danger, though in a different way, of abiding in the letter even in the celebration of this sacred feast. Unless we discern the Lord's body, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but in spirit and in truth, it profiteth us nothing; our coming together at the table of the Lord is unto condemnation. (I Cor. 11:28-34.)

And how much more that is vital and practicable we should get out of the Sermon on the Mount, if instead of approaching it as a code of rules we should view it as a statement of the fundamental principles of the Kingdom of heaven on earth by which our lives are to be guided here and now.

We should bear in mind in the effort to interpret the Master's sayings that the letter killeth and the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that He has spoken are spirit and life, and must be interpreted spiritually and for the uses of life.

Take for instance the injunction, "Whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Is this to be followed literally and without discrimination? Jesus Himself did not act in accordance with the letter of it. When at His trial in the Court of Caiaphas, one of the officers standing by struck Him with his hand, Jesus did not turn the other cheek but entered an earnest remonstrance: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil (i. e. offer it as testimony, let the court judge); but if well, why smitest thou me?" (John 18:19-23.)

The principle involved in the injunction is that in matters of personal injuries we are not to be governed and guided by a spirit of personal revenge and retaliation. We may appeal to the court as Jesus did, or, as He did also, to the sense of right in him who smites. There may be times when the spirit of the command cannot be fulfilled except by turning the other cheek. But, if this is done, it should be in obedience to the spirit and not in subservience to the letter. We are to consider the good of him who smites us and the influence of our reaction to the insult on the society in which we live. In the early settlement of our country there were instances in which the pioneer preachers instead of turning the other cheek, practiced muscular Christianity and gave good drubbings to the bullies who attacked them, which redounded to the progress of the gospel, law and order in the community, and, in some instances, to the eternal salvation of the offenders.

Or take the injunction, "If any man would go to law with thee and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two."

(Matt. 5:40-41.) Would you do just what is here enjoined? Think what is involved. A man's dress in the East consisted ordinarily of only two garments, the coat, or inner tunic, and the outer cloak, which was like a blanket of shawl. This served also for covering, and in the case of the very poor, for bed and covering at night. You will recall the story of the young man spoken of by Mark, (supposed to be Mark himself,) who, awakened suddenly by the tumult when Jesus was being led away from the garden to the court of the high priest, didn't take time to put on his tunic, but cast the linen cloth with which he was covered about him, and fared forth to see what it was all about. "And they laid hold on him; but he left the linen cloth and fled naked." (Mark 14:51-52.) It was at night, which made his plight not quite so distressing.

But your plight, supposing that you had lived in the East in those days, would have been without mitigation, if to a man who in broad daylight had taken away your inner garment you must surrender the only shred of clothing left to cover your nakedness. And to have one's nakedness uncovered was considered, as you know, an unspeakable disgrace and humiliation. This is what a literal interpretation of the words of the Master would involve.

And look at the other injunction: "And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two." On the face and in the letter of it, obedience is mandatory and without exception. "Whosoever" leaves no one out. You may be going in the other direction on very important business or to perform a very sacred duty. You meet a stranger, who, without rhyme or reason, compels you to turn around and go a mile in the opposite direction. At the end of the mile, with unruffled spirit and smiling face, you must offer voluntarily to give him the pleasure of your company and to enjoy the pleasure of his for another mile! Would you do it? I trow not. No wonder that many a literalist has declared the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount utterly impracticable in this world of realities.

But how different these injunctions appear when we pierce the shell of the nut for the kernel, and find within

*"Something not too bright or good*
*For human nature's daily food."*

Let us look at the Master's words again, and let us see if we can get behind the letter to the spirit of them.

Two situations are presented to us. The first is a case in court—a law suit. A man sues another for his coat. The judge, justly or unjustly, decides in favour of the plaintiff, and the man who is wearing the coat is *compelled by the law* to surrender it. Let us fix our mind on that for a moment. In giving up the garment *he is doing only what he is required under penalty of the law to do.* What is the spirit of the Master's injunction to let him have the cloak also? Is it not this, that the children of His Kingdom should live a largely liberal life, not *limited by what the law requires.* "Freely ye have received, *freely* give." Let not your giving be bounded by what the court requires and the sheriff takes. Better do without coat and cloak than to live so thin and poor a life as that! A naked body is better than a shrivelled soul.

And what is the spirit of the other injunction: "And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two"? Let us get the situation. A Roman army is marching along the road, and a disciple is pressed into service and compelled, (the word "compel" is a military term, rendered in the R. V. margin "impress,") under threats of execution by the sword, to carry a soldier's pack for a mile. What is the spirit under the letter of the Master's injunction that the disciple shall volunteer to go with him another mile? Is it not this, that our helpfulness to others is not to wait on threats and conscription? As in the first situation we are taught to do more than we are required to do under penalty of the law, so in this we are to do more than we can be compelled to do by threats and violence. Surely this should not be considered impracticable. It is the way of the liberal soul, and "the liberal soul shall be made fat." It is a virtue that brings its own reward.

It is, first of all, the way to promotion and success in the business world. Someone has said, "If you never do anything more than you are paid for, you will never be paid for anything more than you do." A great American banker in speaking to a young men's business club not long ago told them the secret of his own success:—"The firm with which I was employed used to send out many hundreds of circulars daily. In the somewhat primitive circumstances of that day and place sponges for the wetting of stamps were an unknown luxury. The process employed was the natural one of licking the stamps. From a sheet of one hundred stamps you tore off a row of ten, passed your tongue over the back of the row, and then by a deft manipulation despatched ten envelopes. Three of us sitting in a line were engaged for a certain period each day in that proceeding. By dint of strenuous application I soon became an adept at the job, and accomplished the triumph of holding the office record as to speed in licking stamps, while yet observing the requirements of neatness and accuracy in placing each stamp straight and square in its proper place in the upper right hand corner of the envelope. Two or three times I noticed our 'boss' standing near the place where we worked, but I had no idea that the—to me—great man would deign to observe our humble activity. After a while he called me before him, and informed the blushing youth that I was promoted, in recognition of the zeal, energy, and accurateness with which I had accomplished the function of stamp-licker. It was a valuable lesson to me, both then, and in later life." (From an address before the *Harvard Business School Club of New York* by Otto Kahn.) His promotion and success was due to doing more than he was required to do. He went the second mile. If he had done no more than he was paid for, he would never have been paid for any more than he did.

Not long ago I came upon the following story, which if not literally true has remarkable verisimilitude: "Mr. Bryden was looking for a boy to start to work in his hardware store and learn the business. He picked three boys for a try-out, Ed

Mable, Jack Morris, and Tom Beech. Taking them one at a time on separate days, to each he handed an aluminum pie pan with instructions to deliver it to Mrs. J. B. Peterson, of 789 Chestnut Street.

"Ed telephoned back from a drug store to ask whether the number was 798 or 897, and finally he returned with the pie pan, saying there was no such number.

"Jack, on his try-out came back in due time, bringing his pie pan and reporting that 789 Chestnut Street was a Church, but that a Mrs. J. B. Peterson had lived at 789½, and had recently moved away.

"Tom Beech took longer than the other boys to do the errand, but he returned without the pie pan. He had learned the same things Jack had learned, but he had not stopped there. He had ascertained the new address of Mrs. Peterson and had gone there. Mrs. Peterson told him (and of course it was true) that she had ordered no pie pan. But Tom had unwrapped it and showed it to her and had told her the price that had been mentioned to him and had induced her to accept it and pay for it.

"Which boy did Mr. Bryden hire?"

The boy, of course, who had done more than he was required to do, the boy who had gone the second mile.

The adoption of the same principle leads to large and liberal citizenship and to the gratitude and esteem of one's fellow-citizens.

Into the town in which I live there came from another state some years ago a man of large wealth. As the wealthiest man in the community his taxes exceeded those of any other citizen. These taxes he was required by law to pay. He might have taken the ground that as the law required him to pay so much into the treasury of the city, he would do no more. But instead of this he opened his purse so freely that he was soon recognised as the city's chief benefactor. He donated land for parks. He built and endowed a public library, and used his wealth in many other helpful ways. His name is held in high honour and memorials have been erected to his memory. By doing more than he was required to do, which is the spirit of going the second mile and of the surrender of the second garment, his own personality was enlarged and ennobled, and he won recognition as a large-hearted citizen.

But on a still higher plane the adoption of this principle puts one in the class of great Christians, who through humble and self-sacrificing service win the Master's approval and praise.

When I was a boy I knew a young man who had graduated from the department of civil engineering in one of our universities. Before his death, which occurred a few years ago, he had risen to the Chairmanship of the Executive Committee of the Southern Pacific Railway. The following story is told of him by a friend who knew him well. Soon after graduation he accepted a position with Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railway and Steamship Company. He reported in New Orleans for duty and was put in charge of a small surveying party. The work to be done was distant from the city in a sparsely inhabited district hardly more than a swampy wilderness.

The party had been at work but a short while when one of the chainmen was brought down with yellow fever. Every man in the squad fled for his life. What was the young engineer to do? He was in his early twenties with his life before him. He was brilliant and well-prepared in his chosen profession. Conscious of his powers and seething with the confident ambition of strong, capable youth, must he cast all this aside and risk his life in nursing a man who in all probability would die, and who could be fully replaced by any one of a thousand of his kind? Whatever questionings of this sort may have stirred in his mind, he decided to stay with his man. To obtain necessaries he erected a board on a rising bit of ground some distance from his camp and wrote on it what he needed from day to day. The supplies were left there and he brought them in.

The sick man lingered for weeks and then died. But the young engineer thought his duty not yet completed. He made requisition on the board, now warped and weather-beaten by rain and sun, for a coffin, a Bible and a spade.

Alone he dug the grave; he placed the loathsome body in the coffin, and lowered it to its last resting-place. But not yet did he deem his duty fully done. He read a passage of Scripture and offered a prayer, that the poor chainman might have a Christian burial. Thus having done all, he went home and to bed stricken with yellow fever. God spared his life, and he rose to a position of great honour and usefulness. But far beyond anything he accomplished in the way of personal advancement or of material worth to the world stands this record of the second mile,—if such self-sacrifice and devotion and Christian delicacy can be measured by rod and chain. (E. S. Clascock in *The Manufacturer's Record*—Condensed.)

These simple stories have been told as bringing home to us as no abstract discussion could, how sayings of Christ which interpreted after the letter have no relation to human life, have, when interpreted after the spirit, rich and varied applications to this work-a-day world and its toilers.

"The Jews," says Pascal, "by adhering to the letter of the law were misled into unbelief." Those who are Protestant-born may by adhering to the letter of the gospel be misled into rejection of Him who is the heart of the Gospel.

Take, for instance, this statement of the conditions of discipleship made by the Master. "If any man come to me and hate not his father and his mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea and even his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14:26.) This was recently sent in to Dr. Cadman with the following comment and question:—"While I find much to admire in Christ's teachings it is utterly impossible for me to be one of His followers according to this rule. How can any normal man hate the mother who gave him birth, and the faithful and devoted wife of his heart, or the children who have come to bless his life? Is not this an impossible requirement of the Christian religion?"

Could there be a better illustration of the misleading and killing power of taking literally the orientalisms of Christ's speech. Only by immersing such sayings in the spirit of the gospel as a whole, and purging them of their literalism, can we get at their living and practical significance. Jesus Himself did not hate His mother and sisters and brethren. The natural inference from the meagre hints and larger silences concerning His life in Nazareth is that Joseph died while Jesus was still quite young and that He, as the eldest, became the chief support of His mother and the younger children. He blessed and sanctified the relation of husband and wife at the wedding in Cana of Galilee. He went into the home of Simon Peter to restore to health a beloved member of the household. He raised to life the daughter of Jairus and gave her back to her loving parents, as he did also in the case of the widow's son at Nain. He found a haven of rest for Himself in the home of Martha and Mary and their brother Lazarus, and when the tie between the brother and sisters was broken by death He repaired the breach by the greatest of His miracles. In the agony of His last hour on the cross He committed His mother to the care of the disciple whom he loved.

It cannot be, then, that his words about hating the members of one's own household in order to be His disciples are to be taken literally. "The disciple is not above his lord." And yet they have solemn and tremendous significance after being purged of the letter. Neither father, nor mother, nor wife, nor children, nor brothers, nor sisters may be permitted to stand between us and the loyal obedience and whole-hearted service that we owe to Him. The hard saying in the passage from Luke is brought from the shadow of the letter into the sun-light of the spirit by a parallel passage in Matthew's gospel: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me, and he that does not take his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me." (Matt. 10:34-39.)

There are some of us who have known professed followers of Christ embittered against Him and estranged from His service, because, as they have said in their bereavement, He has taken from their home a child or some other loved member of the household.

On the other hand we have witnessed the voluntary separation, during long periods of time, of missionaries of the cross from wife and children, whom they loved better than life itself, when called by the Providence of God, and the voice of the Master, to make the sacrifice. Some have suffered disinheritance at the hand of fathers rather than close their ears to the call of God through the man of Macedonia. And the annals of Christian martyrdom are full of examples of those who counted not their lives dear unto themselves that they might be found walking the way of Christ's will though it led to the cross or the stake. Thousands out of love to Him have parted with their most prised possessions and submitted to the severing of the tenderest ties that bind heart to heart, and laid life itself upon the altar, as if these were hated things to be abjured and thrown away. To them the flesh and the letter profited nothing, because in the deepest experiences of the soul, they had found that the words of the Master are "spirit and life."

What we surrender for Him becomes ours in a larger and more real sense than it was before the surrender. All that we yield to Him is multiplied to us, not in the letter, but in the spirit of that other saying of His, "Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands, for my sake, and for the gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundred fold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life." (Mark 10:29-30.)

"The letter," says Lessing, "is not the spirit. The spirit acts through the letter, but is not bound to it. It blows where it will, and it blows everywhere."

The Bible needs to be read in the free winds of the spirit, even though these winds sweep the letter into the wilderness and out of sight. The doctrine of verbal inspiration should not be used as a vacuum, or in that fear of drafts which moved a former generation to keep the windows tightly closed. The spirit of Scripture should not be sacrificed to the exact letter of Scripture.

Dr. George William Brown, General Secretary of the American Bible Society, tells in a recent number of the *Christian Observer* of some of the problems confronted by the missionaries in translating the Scriptures into the language of the Bulus of West Africa.

For instance, the saying of Jesus, "What man is there of you, who, if his son shall ask for a fish, will give him a serpent." (Matt. 7:9.) It so happens that the Bulus regard serpents as a great delicacy, and a Bulu boy would be more pleased to have his father give him a serpent than to receive the gift of a fish. But there is a common reptile found in Bluland which not even a Bulu boy would care to eat. It is the centipede. The translators, therefore, with more regard to the spirit than the letter, substituted "centipede" for "serpent."

When they came to Christ's warning against laying up treasure, "where moth and rust corrupt" (Matt. 6:19), they remembered that moths do not trouble Bulu treasures. They have no fur coats nor woolen garments for moths to feed upon. But they have a very destructive insect known as the bibiam which is a great annoyance to the housewife. So the translation runs, "Do not lay away goods where bibiam and rust eat."

When the translators came to deal with the moral sense or voice of God which we call conscience the task of discovering a proper term was not easy, says Dr. Brown. After trying different words and phrases, none of which were satisfactory, they hit upon a striking native expression which answered better than any of them. It was found that the Bulus have a suggestive term which they apply to their lingering remnant of a conscience, which they designate "little man of the heart." And so these quaint suggestive words appear in the Bulu translation, and this unique and hidden "little man of the heart" speaks louder and is obeyed better since he has his place in the oracles of the new-found God.

Of course, as the church standards declare, the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, being immediately inspired by God, are to be regarded as the final appeal in all controversies of religion. (*Westminster Confession of Faith*, Chap. I, Par. VIII.) But here again it is to be remembered that the letter killeth; it is the spirit that quickeneth. It is important to determine the exact words of the original, not for the sake *of the words*, but for the sake of *the idea* conveyed by the words to those who used these languages in their daily speech. It is this idea that is to be carried to present day readers and hearers of the Scripture. If this can best be done by change of words, the change should be made. Not to do so would be to sacrifice the spirit to the letter.

The work of the translators of the Bible into the Bulu language is a suggestive example of changing the vessel in order to save its contents. It has a range of suggestion far beyond the particular case to which they applied it. It illustrates the important principle that the letter is to be sacrificed to the spirit and not the spirit to the letter in all our handling of Scripture. It is a saying of Dr. Franz Delitzsch, that "interpretation is one, application is manifold." The Scripture can have only one literal meaning, and this should be determined first of all; but not for its own sake, but because it is the shell in which the spirit of the Scripture comes to us. But, as Lessing says, "The letter is not the spirit. The spirit acts through the letter, but is not bound to it. It blows where it will, and it blows everywhere."

To abide in the letter often means to miss the spirit, and even to act in opposition to the spirit. I had a parishioner once who was fond of quoting the warning of the Master, "When thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogue and in the streets that they may have glory of men. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." (Matt. 6:2-3.) He was often heard boasting that he never let any one know how much he was giving to this or that beneficent cause. He failed to realise that in his very boasting of obedience to the letter he was violating the spirit of Christ's injunction. He was sounding his trumpet in the synagogue and in the streets, not indeed to get glory from men for his gifts, but for his way of giving. He failed to see that it was the blowing of the trumpet to proclaim his own praise-worthiness, whether in his alms or in his almsgiving, that was the point of the Master's warning.

Not long ago I came across a striking illustration of the difference between the letter and the spirit in the interpretation and application of a principle. I have in my library an old book of law maxims, published in Philadelphia in 1818. One of these maxims runs thus: "*Lex neminem cogit ad impossibilia,—the law compels no man to impossibilities*. Thus the condition of a bond to go to Boston in a few hours would be void, from its impossibility." The spirit of the maxim still holds; the letter of its application is out of date. To go from Philadelphia to Boston in a few hours is not among the impossibilities today.

"In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." These examples are so palpable and crass as illustrations of dangers into which some have fallen, that the slightest implication that birds so wise as we are could be entrapped in meshes so coarse might be regarded as an obtrusive suggestion, if not an insult. But we should remember that there are subtler snares and traps more cunningly concealed, in which the wisest birds may be caught and caged. The letter first catcheth and then killeth. Only the spirit can save us from the snare of the fowler, causing us to know the truth, that the truth that lies beyond the letter may make and keep us free.

The Jews to whom Christ spoke had little idea that they were slaves to the letter in which they were content lazily to abide. We are told that the prophets, on the other hand, searched diligently what or what manner of time the Spirit did point unto beyond the letter of the word committed to them. (I Peter 1:10-11.) "Ye do search the Scriptures," said Christ to certain Jews who quoted the law of Moses against Him because He had healed the lame man at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath day. "Ye do search the Scriptures, because ye think that *in them ye have eternal life*; and these are they which bear witness of *Me;* and *ye will not come to Me that ye may have life.*" We may be searchers of Scripture, thinking that in *them* we have eternal life, not knowing that they can lead us into life only as we find behind the letter of the Word *Him who is the Way, and the Truth, and the Life.*

The cry of our hearts should be,

*"Beyond the sacred page, I seek Thee, Lord:*
*My spirit pants for Thee, O living Word."*

## III

## THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE INSTITUTION

ABOUT twenty years ago I was visiting in "a best-regulated family," in which the proverbial accident had happened. The accident, in this particular instance, took the shape of a boy of five, the youngest of six children, who went by the sobriquet of "The Anarchist." I soon found that this young gentleman had honestly earned his nickname, for he manifested in speech and behaviour an innate and undisguised antagonism to all rule, authority, tradition, custom and convention. And yet I could see that under an insistent domestic pressure, exerted by parents, brothers and sisters, with results often droll and humorous to the rest, but always grim and dolorous to him, the young anarchist was slowly but surely, unwillingly but inevitably, being brought under the family yoke.

I saw him again recently, after the lapse of nearly two decades, and lo, the embryonic insurgent has evolved into a social conformist and a law-abiding citizen. He has learned something of the inter-relations of the individual and the institutions of society.

For the family is the original and fundamental social institution. Out of its soil have sprung the church and the state. Under the primitive patriarchal society, the father was both the civil and religious ruler, the king and the priest of his household, as he should be today and always, up to the point where families merge by their common interests into that comprehensive religious institution called the church, and that comprehensive civil institution known as the state. These three social institutions stand out in a class by themselves as essential to the completeness of humanity. No man is quite normal, no man can exercise his full duties and privileges as a member of society who does not maintain a relationship, not merely passive and formal, but active and vital, to family, church and state.

Out of the relation of man to man, of family to family, of state to state, in the exchange of material things, have emerged the commercial and economic institutions of society, which at present are engaging, as never before, the serious attention of statesmen, and the noisy strife of political parties.

I propose for discussion in this lecture the reciprocal relations of the individual man and the institutions of society—domestic, commercial, political and ecclesiastical; or in briefer terms: "Individualism *versus* Institutionalism." The balancing and adjusting of these two is the great problem of man as a social being.

It has been well said that man is the only animal that capitalises his discoveries. This capitalisation is found in the social institutions already mentioned. Hence, while other animals are guided by instinct, man is guided largely by tradition. But tradition tends to harden, to become an entailed estate, an inalienable inheritance of ideas from the past through the family, the church, the state, and the prevailing economic system. If man capitalised only those ideas that are true and safe and sane, it would greatly simplify all social problems. It would be the part of the individual merely to accept as an entailed estate the traditions of the past. There would be no room for a sifting process, and therefore little play of individual freedom, and little opportunity of personal development, or of social progress. But unfortunately, or fortunately, man capitalises also his mistakes and blunders, as well as the findings of truth and fact. Now each individual is an heir to this capitalisation; and furthermore, he must add his mite to the inheritance of future generations. Hence, in all essential matters, it is of vital importance to himself and to his successors that he should test as by fire the traditions of the past to see "whether they be gold, silver and precious stones, or wood, hay and stubble." The temper in which he sets himself to this task determines his classification as a social factor. If his chief fear is lest in rejecting the bad, he should lose also a modicum of the good, he is a conservative, and sometimes a reactionary. If his chief fear is lest in a meticulous regard for the good, he spare also the worthless and the harmful, he is a radical. He pulls up by the roots both wheat and tares. If he stands on the lid of the past, and watches the procession go by, he is a "stand-patter." If he marches in the front rank, with more valour than discretion, he is an ultra-progressive. Between these last two moves the "animated conservative," as Woodrow Wilson called himself, whose motto is:

> *"May freedom's oak forever live*  
> *With stronger life from day to day;*  
> *That man's the true conservative*  
> *Who lops the moulder'd branch away."*

By his side, and near akin to him, moves the conservative progressive, who may be defined as a man who believes in driving ahead, but not so fast as to spill his load.

> *"We move, the wheel must always move,*  
> *Nor always on the plain,*  
> *And if we move to such a goal*  
> *As wisdom hopes to gain,*  
> *Then you that drive, and know your craft,*  
> *Will firmly hold the rein,*  
> *Nor lend an ear to random cries,*  
> *Or you may drive in vain;*  
> *For some cry 'Quick' and some cry 'Slow,'*  
> *But while the hills remain,*  
> *Up hill 'Too-slow' will need the whip,*  
> *Down hill 'Too-quick' the chain."*

Between institutionalism and individualism there is a never-ceasing conflict! "There is an everlasting struggle in every mind," as Professor James has said, "between the tendency to keep unchanged, and the tendency to renovate our ideas. Our education, too, is a ceaseless compromise between the conservative and the progressive factors." The storing of the memory tends to create a reverence for the past. The training of the powers of observation tends to subordinate the teachings of the past to the discoveries, and, unless the logical faculty is strengthened, to the unproved hypotheses of the present. Classical education leans to institutionalism; scientific education to individualism. Each has its virtues and its vices; its potentialities and its perils. Professor William James proclaims his faith in "personal freedom and its spontaneities," and his suspicion of "civilisation" with "its herding and branding, its licensing and degree-giving, its authorising and appointing, and, in general, its regulating and administering by system the lives of human beings." "Surely," says he, "the individual, the person in the singular number, is the more fundamental phenomenon, and the social institution, of whatever grade, is but secondary and ministerial."

On the other hand, Walter Bagehot declares that "the active voluntary part of a man is very small. . . . It is the traditional habit of mankind that guides most men's actions, and is the steady frame in which each new artist must set the picture that he paints. . . . Other things being equal, yesterday's institutions are by far the best for today; they are the most ready, the most influential, the most easy to get obeyed, the most likely to retain the reverence which they inherit, and which every other must win." (Quoted by W. M. Macgregor—*Christian Freedom*, p. 3.)

As usual the path of wisdom is the golden mean. Institutionalism tends to tyranny, individualism tends to anarchy. Institutionalism tends to "timorous adherence to what is familiar;" individualism tends to the worship of gods that are new and strange, and often false. "Either left to itself would crush society, one by emptying it of initiative, the other by splitting it into a company of warring atoms. Ordinarily each is dimly aware of its need of an opponent, yet does not on that account denounce him the less, or less eagerly struggle to expel him from provinces asserted to be its own." (Geo. Herbert Palmer, *The Nature of Goodness*, p. 42.) The self-assertion of the individual must yield in a degree to the institutions of society. No man, for instance, can say, "I will not accept the language of my country and of my race. I will use a language of my own invention." So he may. But who will speak his language, and who will understand *him* speaking it? There are social customs and conventionalities so well established that, like language, they have become indispensable mediums of social intercommunication and intercourse. The man who disregards them cuts himself off from communion with his kind. There is a self-assertion that is part of manhood, a characteristic of virile individuality. It is often quiet and unassuming, but fearless and immovable, and on occasion aggressive, in defending the rights of conscience and of the mind. And there is an individualism that is heady and high-minded, full of bluster and conceit. A man may draw himself up to his full height, but he cannot, by thinking more highly of himself than he ought to think, add one cubit to his stature.

Gilbert K. Chesterton chooses two contemporary figures in British politics to illustrate these types. "Mr. Keir Hardie," says he, "holds up his head as man. Mr. Crooks wishes to follow his nose as Crooks." (Quoted by W. M. Macgregor—*Christian Freedom*, p. 50.)

Now, the conflict between institutionalism and individualism is likely to arise at every point of contact between the two—domestic, economic, ecclesiastical or political. Let us consider briefly these four fields of possible conflict.

1. Family loyalty, for instance, may be carried so far as to bind the individual hand and foot, to sacrifice him on the altar of family tradition.

"When the hero of Coningsby took it into his head to form a deliberate conviction of his own, his grandfather cried, 'You go with your family, sir, like a gentleman; you are not to consider your opinions, like a philosopher or a political adventurer.'" (Quoted by Professor Ross, *Social Psychology*, p. 251.)

In the same strain, Matthew Arnold declares that "adherence to family traditions renders aristocracies unapt to see how the world is going." Their chief characteristic, he observes, is their "natural inaccessibility, as children of the established fact, to ideas, and their peculiar serenity appears to come from their never having any ideas to trouble them. And so in a time of expansion, a time for ideas, one gets perhaps, in regarding an aristocracy, even more than the idea of serenity, the idea of futility and sterility."

"Aristocracies," says Professor Edward A. Ross, "always magnify lineage, ancestral achievement and family honours and privileges, so that quite aside from the dictates of their class interests, they cannot help imbibing the conservative spirit. The middle and working classes, lacking time and means for cultivating these sentiments, let their thought and feeling be shaped by present facts rather than ancient facts, and are, therefore, the mainstay of liberalism and reform. . . .

"The universal westward migration that prevailed during the settlement of our country, by incessantly snapping ties between blood relatives and thereby weakening clan feeling, helped to individualise Americans, and has undoubtedly been a factor in their progressiveness."

On the other hand this centrifugal force of individualisation may easily gain too great momentum, and must be held in check by the centripetal pull of family tradition and early training, lest the individual become a wandering star with neither orbit nor objective in life.

"Since custom is the principal magistrate of man's life," says Bacon, "let men by all means endeavour to obtain good customs. Certainly custom is most perfect when it beginneth in young years: this we call education, which is, in effect but an early custom. So we see in languages the tongue is more pliant to all expressions and sounds, the joints are more supple to all feats of activity and motions in youth than afterwards." (Bacon's *Essays—XXXIX.)* What is true of the tongue and limbs, is true also of the mind and heart. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." (Proverbs 22:6.) The margin of the Revised Version renders it, "Train up a child *according to his way*," which seems to imply that the child's individuality is to be considered, and that the training is to have regard to the particular child's temperament and bent. A child's initiative, for instance, may seem to sprout too luxuriantly, like a wild vine, and may cause a good deal of inconvenience. It is not on that account to be repressed, but wisely directed.

The boy Edison was put off the train at Smith's Creek Station years ago because of his initiative in a chemical experiment that set fire to the baggage car. But it was this God-given but troublesome spirit of initiative in the boy that later flooded the world with radiance and brought to the great inventor in his old age the grateful homage of the nations at "The Golden Jubilee of Light." It would have been a costly thing for the world if in putting out the fire that he had kindled in the baggage car, the fire that burned in the boy's heart had likewise been quenched. But God had said once more, "Let there be light," and the flame of individualism which He had kindled in the boy could not be smothered in the salvage of a railway baggage car, which may be regarded as representing an institution of society. The boy with initiative is likely to be a disturber of peace in the home, but his individualism should not be sacrificed on the altar of domestic comfort. There should be restraint but not repression.

2. Passing now from the domestic to the commercial, we find that there has developed in modern industry and trade a *complex* of antagonism between individualism and collectivism. That is, collectivism has invaded the fields of both labour and capital. Both have been to some extent institutionalised, and consequently a corresponding restraint has been placed in both on the freedom of the individual. The conflict rages not only between capital on the one hand and labour on the

other, but each harbours a conflict within its own field. Its foes are those of its own household.

Let us trace briefly the rise and progress of this conflict. After the introduction of machinery and the consequent organisation of the factory system in England in the early years of the nineteenth century, trade-unions sprang into existence "to resist the intolerable physical and moral conditions under which the great manufacturing industries were conducted." (*The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism in a Democracy*—Dr. Charles W. Eliot, p. 10.)

From Great Britain it spread to other countries, coming "comparatively late to the United States, the individualistic quality of the original population being a strong obstacle to their progress in this country." But the unprecedented development of mechanical power and of the factory system in the United States stimulated a corresponding development and activity of the labour unions. The spirit of American individualism still exerts a restraining influence on institutionalised labour, but the individual and the institution are necessarily more or less in conflict within the unions, and to a still greater degree between the unions and non-union labour. It is obvious that so long as one holds membership in a group, one must conform to the group rules and the will of the majority. In the case of the labour unions the individual member must take part in a strike on vote of the majority of his union. In doing this he surrenders a part of his individual liberty and shares with his group the hardship to himself and his family in the suspension of wages.

"The trades-unions have made it their chief object in recent years to secure higher and higher wages and shorter and shorter hours, and to this end they have sought to secure a monopoly each of its own kind of labour. . . . This labour monopoly has threatened so seriously the industries of the country, that another kind of collective action, which also interferes greatly with individual liberty, became indispensable." (*The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism*—Dr. Charles W. Eliot, p. 15.) Just as labour was institutionalised to provide collective protection from intolerable conditions imposed by the great manufacturing industries, capital followed suit, and has become institutionalised in the organisation of employers' associations for mutual protection against unreasonable demands on the part of the trades-unions. And just as the operative surrenders a part of his individual liberty in joining the union, so the employer surrenders a part of his in joining the association. "He can no longer carry on his business in his own way; he must take into account the collective interest of the class to which he belongs and the dangers which threaten the employing class as a whole." (*The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism*—Dr. Charles W. Eliot, p. 21.)

It may be observed in passing that whilst the Church cannot afford to be indifferent, she should not allow herself to be used as a tool by either capital or labour in conflicts that may arise between these two forms of collectivism. She should remember the reply of her Master to one who appealed to Him in a dispute over material possessions: "Man, who made me a judge or divider over you?" But immediately He added the warning and admonition needed by both disputants, "Take heed, and keep yourselves from covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." (Luke 12:13-15.)

I do not believe, however, that the Synod of the Province of Sewanee of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in view of recent disturbances in the textile industries, transcended proper ecclesiastical functions in petitioning congress "to authorise the President of the United States to appoint a national industrial commission, to make a thorough and scientific study of the textile industry, both South and North, at the earliest date, and that the result be published by the United States Government." (Action of the Province of Sewanee of the Protestant Episcopal Church—Nov. 7, 1929.) This, it seems to me, is much better than the policy of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America to investigate and attempt to settle disputes between capital and labour directly by the Federal Council's Commission on the Church and Social Service. (See *Twenty Years of Church Federation*—1929, pp. 62-63.)

In my judgment our own Church interprets a little too narrowly the sound principle of the Westminster Confession, that "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by humble petition in cases extraordinary." (Chapter XXXI, IV.)

The true balance of individualism and collectivism is pointed out by Dr. Eliot in the following admirable statement:

"Individualism values highly not only the rights of the single person, but also the initiative of the individual left free by society. Collectivism values highly social rights, objects to an individual initiative which does mischief when left free, holds that the interest of the many should override the interest of the individual, whenever the two interests conflict, and should control social action, and yet does not propose to extinguish the individual, but only to restrict him for the common good, including his own." (*The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism in a Democracy*, by Charles W. Eliot, pp. 1-2.)

The peril of collectivism, whether in labour unions or employers' associations, is its tendency to crush initiative and independence and to interfere with the free exercise of the individual's conscience and judgment.

This, of course, enfeebles society by dwarfing the powers of its constituent personalities. "There is a sense," wrote Woodrow Wilson, "in which in our day the individual has been submerged. Men work, not for themselves, and not as partners in the old way in which they used to work, but generally as employees of great corporations. There was a time when corporations played a very minor part in our business affairs, but now they play the chief part, and most men are the servants of corporations. . . . If the corporation is doing the things that it ought not to do, you (as a servant) really have no voice in the matter, and must obey the orders, and you have sometimes with deep mortification to co-operate in the doing of things which you know are against the public interest. Your individuality is swallowed up in the individuality and purpose of a great organisation." (*The New Freedom*, pp. 5-6.) The trend today is toward a few great mergers, centralising the business of the country in the hands of a few men. Business is becoming more and more institutionalised. The chain store is driving out the independent small dealer, or making him an employee, instead of an owner and proprietor of his own business. Advancement depends less and less on personal initiative and more and more on cog-like adjustment in a huge machine. This is the natural result in an industrialised civilisation. "Although machinery makes man collectively more lordly in his attitude toward nature, it tends to make the individual man more submissive to his group." (Betrand Russell in *Whither Mankind*, edited by Charles A. Beard, p. 78.) Adapting the words of Tennyson, we may say that under our present economic system "the individual withers, and the *group* is more and more."

3. The same problem presents itself in the sphere of political institutions. Civil government is essential to organised society. To accomplish its ends, it must be armed with some kind and degree of power. But power lodged in human hands is liable to abuse or over-use.

The critical point around which political conflict ever rages is the question, how much authority shall the civil government exercise, how far shall it be allowed to intrude upon private premises, to levy taxes upon private property, to command the services of the individual, to restrict his personal liberty, and to control or paternalise his private business.

Thomas Hobbes, in his *Leviathan*, taught that the civil government is absolute as against the individual, that it is the leviathan whose privilege it is to swallow all. Mr. Jefferson, on the other hand, declared that the best government is the government that governs least. Woodrow Wilson speaking of the theory that our government should be a government by trustees and guardians instead of "a government of the people, by the people, for the people," eloquently declared, that "freemen need no guardians." "Today supremely," said he, "does it behoove this nation to remember that a people shall be saved by the power that sleeps in its own bosom, or by none. . . . Not from above; not by patronage of its aristocrats. The flower does not bear the root, but the root the flower. Everything that blossoms in beauty in the air of heaven draws its fairness, its vigour, from its roots. Nothing living can blossom into fruitage unless through nourishing stalks deep-planted in the common soil. The rose is merely the evidence of the vitality of the root; and the real source of its beauty, the very blush that it wears upon its tender cheek, comes from those silent sources of life that lie hidden in the chemistry of the soil. Up from that soil, up from the silent bosom of the earth, rise the currents of life and energy. Up from the common soil, up from the quiet heart of the people, rise joyously today streams of hope and determination bound to renew the face of the earth in glory." (*The New Freedom*, p. 88.)

However much as we may disapprove of the philosophy of Treitschke, which is said to have been the spring and source of German militarism, we shall all no doubt be ready to applaud the following maxim of his, quoted by General Bernhardi: "Every extension of the state is beneficial and wise, if it arouses, promotes and purifies the independence of free and reasoning men; it is evil when it kills and stunts the independence of free men."

This general proposition, sound as it is, does not, however, solve the problem. For the question still remains, what activities of the state are likely to promote, and what are likely to stunt, the independence of free and reasoning men?

This is the question that divides the Tories and the Liberals in Great Britain, and the followers of Alexander Hamilton and of Thomas Jefferson in this country.

It is the problem of institutionalism versus individualism in the field of politics.

4. The same conflict between the individual and the institution emerges in religion. Over-emphasis of the ecclesiastical institution tends to a merely formal acceptance of creeds imposed by authority without personal experience of the truth, and to the perfunctory performance of rites and ceremonies without a living heart and the offering of a reasonable service unto God. But now and again "there arises a man, Protestant born, whose instinct it is to interrogate and dispute. For him that which exists has no peculiar sanctity, and the

fact that it has stood so long is rather a suggestion that the time for change has fully come." (W. M. Macgregor—*Christian Freedom*, p. 2.)

So his challenge rings out. "I said the Christian must judge for himself," cried Luther at Worms, "as he must live and die for himself; and the Pope is not umpire in spiritual things." This sentiment was formulated shortly afterwards in a declaration that came out of the fires of ecclesiastical persecution, and is a charter of religious liberty for the individual as against the tyranny of the institution: "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, and the requiring of an implicit faith and an absolute and blind obedience is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also. Synods and councils may err, and many have erred; therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith and practice, but to be used as a help in both." (*Westminster Confession of Faith*—Chapter xx, Par. ii, Chapter xxxi, Par. iii.)

In the Old Testament, institutionalism was represented by the priest, who was by inheritance and training an intense conservative; individualism was represented by the prophet, who came with glowing lips from the very presence of God, bringing a fresh and burning message to men of his day. Elijah emerged from the solitude of the wilderness with startling suddenness, claiming as the basis of his authority no ordaining act of priest or church, but bursting in upon the king with the cry, "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand."

Alluding to the contrast between priest and prophet, as representatives, respectively, of institutionalism and individualism, Dean Inge observes that "religion needs both, and must have an institutional as well as a mystical element." If the priest expels the prophet, we shall have a dead church worshipping a dead Christ. So if the seer and prophet expel the priest, there will be no discipline and coherence in the church. The great problem here as elsewhere is to strike the proper balance between individualism and institutionalism, between "self-assertion and self-surrender," between independence and deference, between private judgment and the prestige of tradition.

"Churches," says William James, "when once established live at second-hand upon tradition—personal religion is the primordial thing." But, as Dr. Willard L. Sperry says, "Josiah Royce supplemented William James's conception of religion, when he drew his picture of the 'Beloved Community' wherein our happiness and strength are found, and where our ultimate life in religion must be lived." (*The Disciplines of Liberty*—pp. 146-147.)

The present is built on the past, and the foundations of the past are laid in institutions. "The individual must begin by sitting at the feet of tradition, if he is to enter into any spiritual inheritance which is of any value; and this holds good in the sphere of religion as truly as in the spheres of morality or of human culture in general." (A. E. J. Rawlinson—*Christian Freedom*, p. 3.)

The relation of the individual to the church is like that of the branch to the tree. We may apply the Apostle's words to the individualist: "Thou, being a wild olive, wast grafted in among the branches and didst become partaker with them of the root and fatness of the olive tree; glory not over the branches, but if thou gloriest, it is not thou that bearest the root, but the root thee." (Romans 11:17-18.)

The individual, while he recognises and rejoices in his individuality, with the distinctive privileges and responsibilities involved in it, is to be reverent, humble-minded, forbearing, and tolerant as a member of Christ's Church. He is not the root that has life in itself and imparts it to the tree. He is a branch, and only one among many, dependent for life and fruitfulness on the root, and partaking with the other branches "of the root and fatness of the olive tree." "In meekness of wisdom" let him bring forth the fruits of righteousness.

Involved in the relation of the individual to the ecclesiastical institution is his relation to the creed of his church. The creed is the official formula of corporate belief. It is supposed to be the least common denominator of the individual convictions of the group. Wherever men come together in associate relations there is the tendency to formulate the opinions, principles, and policies that hold them together. This is their creed. In the church the creeds represent the crystallisation of beliefs that have been held in solution till the hour of crisis brings on precipitation. Recurring periods of agitation redissolve to some extent that which has been precipitated, and there ensue recrystallisations. Or, to drop the figure, the crises of agitation call with more or less insistence for revision or restatement of the articles of belief. This involves a period of debate which brings into action the conflicting types of mind found in all large groups —radical and reactionary, conservative and progressive in various degreees of conservatism and progressiveness. The resultant is, ordinarily, moderate revision, or restatement with slight variations. Most of the branches of the Presbyterian-Reformed family of Churches have travelled this road in the past half-century. As the revelation given by God in the Holy Scriptures is progressive, we need not wonder that the interpretation of this revelation in the creeds of the church has been progressive. And as to the future, we may hold, with old John Robinson, that more light will still break forth from the Word of God. "Truth," said Calvin, "is the daughter of Time." (*Calvin's Letters*, Vol. I, p. 37.)

The creed, as it is at any one time, represents the ecclesiastical institution and its traditions; the periods of agitation are brought on by the ferment of individualism in the mass or group. The champions of both tendencies are needed. As Dr. George Herbert Palmer says, "Ordinarily each is dimly aware of its need of an opponent, yet does not on that account denounce him the less, or less eagerly struggle to expel him from provinces asserted to be its own." (*The Nature of Goodness*, p. 42.)

The Westminster Confession of Faith strikes the balance between the two, it seems to me, about as satisfactorily as it can be done within the limits of a definite creed. The Form of Government, following the principles of the Confession, requires subscription to the creed of the church by its *officers*. Considerable play is allowed, however, for differences of view in matters of detail, as is shown by the question that must be answered at ordination:—"Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of this Church, as containing *the system of doctrine* taught in the Holy Scriptures; and do you further promise that if at any time you find yourself out of accord with any of the *fundamentals of this system of doctrine*, you will on your own initiative, make known to your Presbytery (or Session) the change which has taken place in your views since the assumption of this ordination vow?" (*Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.*, Par. 136.)

It ought not to be hard for an officer of the church to determine whether he is doctrinally an Athanasian or Arian, an Augustinian or Pelagian, a Calvinist or Arminian. If he is in doubt whether his views are in accord with the fundamentals of the creed, provision is made for him to submit the matter to the ecclesiastical court that has jurisdiction over him. He then has liberty to align himself with the group with which he has theological kinship.

A very important element of freedom within the church creed is generally overlooked by creedal critics. And this is that subscription to the creed *is not required of church members*, as it is of officers, but only a credible profession of faith in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of sinners and of a sincere purpose to live, in dependence upon the grace of the Holy Spirit, as becomes followers of the Master.

Having thus hastily surveyed the struggle between institutionalism and individualism in the various fields on which they meet, we are prepared to gather up, in conclusion, a few general results:

1. Each has its perils. An overwrought institutionalism tends to fetter personal liberty, and to stifle spontaneity, and should be resisted at all hazards.

An over-grown individualism, on the other hand, leads to a contempt for the past with its rich inheritances, a disregard for what has been learned by the race through centuries of painful experience, a recrudescence of old errors under new names, and the mistaking of motion in a whirling eddy for progress along the great currents which issue out of the past and flow through the present to a broader and deeper future.

The true progressive is "the heir of all the ages in the foremost files of time." Let him by all means march, with head erect and eyes alert, "in the foremost files of time." But let him not despise the ranks upon ranks in all the ages of the past, whose marchings have made his present position tenable as a base for further advance.

As Eucken has said, "In personality alone does life reach the height of original creativeness. But the consolidation and realisation of the individual's life are obtained through the community [the institution] which is indispensable on account of its spiritual atmosphere and its historical continuity." This continuity, if it is to be a continuity of progress and not of stagnation, must be ever renewed and quickened from within by the upspringing of free individuals and great personalities along its course. But "the timeless life which the cosmic nature of man desires cannot be acquired by the individual either in a day or in isolation; for in order to climb to its own heights the life must draw the traditional world into itself, and remain in constant intercourse with such a world."

2. The individual who surrenders himself without question or reserve to the institutions of society is a craven and a slave. "For what are men better than sheep or goats that nourish a blind life within the brain," if they follow the old beaten paths simply because they are old and beaten? As Sam W. Foss says:

*"One day, through a primeval wood,*
*A calf walked home as good calves should,*
*And left a trail all bent askew,*
*A crooked trail, as all calves do.*
*Since then two hundred years have fled,*
*And I infer the calf is dead,*
*But still he left behind his trail,*
*And thereby hangs my moral tale.*

*"The trail was taken up next day*
*By a lone dog that passed that way,*
*And then a wise bell-wether sheep*
*Pursued the trail o'er dale and steep,*
*And led his flock behind him, too,*
*As good bell-wethers always do.*

*"And from that day o'er hill and glade,*
*Through those old woods a path was made,*
*And many men wound in and out,*
*And bent and turned and crooked about,*
*And uttered words of righteous wrath,*
*Because 'twas such a crooked path.*

*"But still they followed—do not laugh—*
*The first migrations of that calf,*
*And through this winding wood-way stalked,*
*Because he wobbled when he walked.*

*"And men in two centuries and a half*
*Trod in the footsteps of that calf,*
*For men are prone to go it blind,*
*Along the calf-ways of the mind,*
*And work away from sun to sun,*
*To do as other men have done."*

This is all very well and all very true, but we must avoid the other extreme; for it is no less true that the individual who despises the institutions of society, and wantonly cuts himself loose from its traditions, thereby ignores the value of team-work. He fails to orient himself not only with his contemporaries, and the movements of his own time, but also with the mighty movers and the gigantic movements of the ages. The coral insect who should thus segregate himself would have no part in building the reef that rises from the depths of the ocean into the upper air.

The man who in conceit of his own individuality holds himself aloof from the great institutions of society, where men touch elbows, is a bush-whacker instead of an enlisted soldier, and is contributing to the campaign but a small fraction of his possible efficiency.

John Morley tells us that one of Gladstone's favourite phrases, which also defined one of his marked characteristics, was "The faculty of throwing the mind into the common stock." And then he adds, "The demands of joint stock he never took to mean the quenching of the duty in a man to have a mind of his own." "His principle was to uphold all institutions, tenets, practices, dogmas, whether social, political, or religious, established by the work and views of the best and greatest authorities of the past, until weakness or error were demonstrated. On that principle he acted in great things and small through life." (*After Thirty Years*, by Viscount Gladstone.)

3. The final question which I shall briefly touch is this: Does the individual exist for the social institution, or does the social institution exist for the individual?

This problem was worked at, if not worked out, in Athens many centuries ago. It was an accepted principle for many years among the people of that city that the State was everything, the individual nothing. Education became mechanical. Man became the slave of custom and tradition. Human freedom was cramped and stifled.

Then came a reaction, and the sophists emerged with their famous formula, "Man is the measure of all things." The individual began to assert himself. Personal happiness rather than personal worth became the standard of desire. How to enjoy oneself, not how to serve the state, became the engrossing question. It was an object lesson of individualism gone to seed.

Then Socrates appeared on the scene. He, too, like the sophists, revolted against the older education which made machines of men.

He adopted the maxim of the sophists, "Man is the measure of all things."

But who, asked he, is the man that is to be the measure of all things? Not man the individual, but the larger man, the universal man.

The measure of truth, he declared is not what man, the individual, thinks—that is only opinion—but the universal judgment of mankind, stripped of prejudices and provincialisms.

And so with the interests of man. It is not the interests of man, the individual, but of man in the aggregate, that should be the measure of ambition and of duty.

The individual, then, does not exist for the institution; nor yet the institution for the individual. But both the institution and the individual find the noblest reason of their being in that service of humanity to which God has appointed them. As to the individual, our Lord has said, "He that will be great among you, let him become servant of all." And as to institutions, what He said of the Sabbath applies to them all! They were made for man, not man for them.

But He did not mean, as some seem to infer, that the institution was made for man the individual to use, abuse, or neglect, according to his whims, but to be enjoyed and used by the individual with due regard to that larger man for whom all institutions were made and of whom Socrates spoke—even all humanity.

## IV

# FREEDOM AND THE LAW OF THE STATE

IN this lecture we shall consider the freedom of the individual as restrained by the authority of the state.

I. *God is the supreme authority, and all rightful authority exercised by others is delegated by Him.* In the 82nd Psalm we read, "God standeth in the congregation of God; he judgeth among the gods. How long will ye judge unjustly and respect the persons of the wicked?" On which Dr. Franz Delitzsch comments as follows: "The power of life and death, with which the administration of justice cannot dispense, is a prerogative of God. Ever since Genesis 9:6, (*Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed)*, however, He has transferred the execution of this prerogative to mankind and instituted among them an office bearing the sword. . . . Everywhere among men magistrates are the feudatories and bearers of the image of God, and as being His representatives are therefore also called gods. The God, who has transferred the exercise of His power to these subordinate gods, without divesting Himself of it when committing it to them, now sits in judgment in their circle. How long, He inquires, will ye judge unjustly? How long will ye accept the countenance of the wicked, that is, show respect, regard, favour to their person?" (Commentary on the Psalms, *in loco*.)

In the 13th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle Paul, with this psalm no doubt in mind, says, "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. . . . He (the civil magistrate) beareth not the sword in vain; for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." (Romans 13:1-4.)

Pilate, speaking of his authority as Roman procurator, said to Jesus, "Knowest thou not that I have power (ἐξουσίαν, properly rendered in R. V. margin, *authority*) to release thee, and have power (authority) to crucify thee? Jesus answered him, Thou wouldst have no power (authority) against me, except it were given thee from above." (John 19:10-11.)

From these passages it is abundantly evident that the officers of the law derive their authority from God's ordinance and are responsible to Him. He standeth in every court room, of which the Psalmist says that it is a congregation of God. He judgeth as Supreme among the judges, who because of their delegated powers, are called *gods*. He inquires, "How long will ye show favour to the wicked? Do justice to the afflicted and destitute. Rescue the poor and needy; deliver them out of the hand of the wicked." (Ps. 82:1-4.)

Is it not clear that God is concerned in the whole question of law as the administration of justice?

II. *Since this is true, there is no more vital question in a nation's life than that which concerns its laws.*

From this point of view our nation might be described as *a nation of many laws and of much lawlessness.* Let us face the facts.

A judge of the Court of General Sessions of New York County at the induction of a fellow judge made the statement: "This country is suffering under an indictment which proclaims it the most lawless on earth. You must find that the United States must plead guilty to this indictment."

Evans Clark, commenting on this statement, says, "A more serious charge could hardly be brought against a people." (New York Times, Nov. 2, 1924.)

Dr. Frederick L. Hoffman, consulting statistician of the Prudential Insurance Company of America, has for more than twenty-five years been compiling the homicide rate for twenty-eight of our leading cities. In his report for 1923, he says: "This is the most amazing murder record for any civilised country for which data are available. It indicates a state of affairs so startling and of such significance that no Government, Federal or State, can rightfully ignore the situation. The murder rate has practically doubled in twenty-four years. It has shown a persistent upward trend which may be accepted as a definite indication that the moral and legal forces opposed to wrongful death are yielding to the criminal and murderous instincts of a small but suggestive minority of the American people."

President Hoover in his speech at the luncheon of the Associated Press, April 22, 1929, declared that the dominant issue before the American people is the enforcement of and obedience to the laws of the United States, both Federal and State. "Life and property," said he, "are relatively more unsafe than in any other civilised country of the world. . . . What we are facing today is the possibility that respect for law as law is fading from the sensibilities of our people. No individual has the right to determine what law shall be obeyed and what law shall not be enforced. If a law is wrong, its rigid enforcement is the surest guaranty of its repeal. If it is right, its enforcement is the quickest method of compelling respect for it."

No more solemn challenge has ever been issued to the American people than that contained in the closing sentence of the President's address. The time has come, said he, to "realise that we are confronted with a national necessity of the first degree; that we are not suffering from an ephemeral crime wave, but *from a subsidence of our foundations*."

Long ago the Psalmist asked the solemn question, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Ps. 11:3.) According to the President's speech, this is the peril that threatens us today.

Let us look, first, at some of the facts that justify the indictment of our nation as the most lawless.

The Special Committee on Law Enforcement of the American Bar Association made, in 1924, a detailed report on crime in the United States as compared with other countries. The details of this report have been summarised in Beman's *Capital Punishment* (1925) from which most of the statistics which I shall give have been taken.

"The committee estimated that 9,500 persons were killed in crimes of violence in the United States during the year 1921 alone. During the ten years previous, the committee stated no less than 85,000 people were killed. This means that every year more than four times the number of people lost their lives at the hands of criminals in this country than were killed in the Battle of Gettysburg, one of the bloodiest engagements of the Civil War, and that every five and a half years or so more people are killed in the everyday walks of life in the United States than were killed in the American ranks during the World War.

"Property losses suffered by the people of the United States through burglary and robbery are just as striking. On the basis of property losses through thefts that are known for the year 1921 in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago and Washington, it has been estimated that $302,800,000 are lost every year in this way. William J. Burns, formerly head of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, estimates that more than $100,000,000 a year in property is stolen from railroad, express and steamship companies and from trucks and piers. Figures published by the American Bankers' Association for the year ended August 31, 1922, show that among their number alone there were one hundred and thirty-six hold-ups and three hundred and nineteen burglaries, representing a loss of $1,224,489. That means that every day in the year there is a bank robbery or hold-up of importance, not to mention those committed against banks that are not members of the association.

### *Comparison With Other Nations*

"The evidence so far has proved only that lawlessness in the United States has become a national issue; it does not go to the heart of Judge Talley's indictment. It remains to be shown whether conditions in other countries are better or worse.

"Take England and Wales for Example. There are more than seventeen times as many desperate criminals among the people of New York—men who would not stop at taking life—than there are among the people of England and Wales. In the year 1921 there were 90 murders committed in England and Wales, including cities and country districts. During the same year there were 238 murders committed in the single city of New York. England and Wales have a population of 38 million. There are less than 6 million in New York. (That is, in proportion to population, there were 19 murders in New York to 1 in England and Wales.) Last year there were 27 murders committed in London, against 262 in New York.

"The man who walks the streets of Memphis, Tennessee has one hundred and thirty-five times more chances of being shot or beaten or stabbed to death than the man who lives in England and Wales. There were only twice as many homicides in all of England and Wales in 1922 as in that little Tennessee city of 170,000 population." The excess of homicides in Southern cities as compared with Northern is due chiefly to the large negro population in the former. "A large negro population," says Dr. Max P. Schlapp, "is always accompanied by a high rate of homicides. In the registration area, the homicide rate for whites was 5.6, in 1922, while for coloured it stood at the startling figure of 34.7 per 100,000." (Beman, pp. 39-45.)

"Take another country—Canada—as closely comparable with the United States as any. Were it not for an imaginary line on the map Canada might be the United States along a stretch of 4,000 miles of country. Yet there were 40 more murders committed in Philadelphia—the City of Brotherly Love—in 1923 than in all of Canada of the previous year. Murders were almost forty times as common in Jacksonville, Fla., in 1923 as in Canada the previous year.

"It might be imagined that a country like Italy, where the 'Latin temperament' is reputed to be hasty of action and slow of thought and where the Black Hand and the Vendetta strike in the dark, would far exceed the United States in lawlessness and crime. Dr. Hoffman's statistics show that, as a matter of cold fact, there are twice as many shootings and stabbings to the death in proportion to the population in this country as in Italy. He gives the homicide rate for the United States from 1911 to 1921 as 7.2, per hundred thousand, while that of Italy for the period of 1910 to 1920 was 3.6.

"'With the exception of Italy,' says Dr. Hoffman in summarising the statistics on the comparative criminality rate, 'no other country measurably approaches the United States in the murderous tendency of its people.'

## *The Homicide Record*

"To prove it he cites the following figures, which show the number of homicides per hundred thousand of population as reported in the official records of other countries:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| United States | 7.2 | Norway | 0.8 |
| Italy | 3.6 | England and Wales | 0.8 |
| Australia | 1.9 | Quebec | 0.5 |
| South Africa | 1.8 | Ontario | 0.5 |
| New Zealand | 0.9 | Scotland | 0.4 |
| Ireland | 0.9 | Holland | 0.3 |
| Spain | 0.9 | Switzerland | 0.2 |

"Less violent crimes show even more disquieting differences between the United States and other countries. Take robbery, for instance. The New Yorker is 36 times as likely to be held up on the street or in his home and forcibly deprived of his valuables as the Londoner; while the risk in Chicago is 100 times as great as in London. In 1921 there were 2,558 robberies reported by the Chicago police—over 12 times the number reported in all of England and Wales. Last year more than six times as many people were robbed in two American cities—New York and Chicago—than in all of Canada."

III. *What are the causes of this appalling lawlessness in the United States, and what is the remedy?*

Jurists, publicists, psychologists, and others have diagnosed and prescribed, and there is some truth no doubt in each of their findings and prescriptions.

Richard Washburn Child, former Ambassador to Italy and member of the National Crime Commission, calls the United States "the criminal's paradise." Speaking of the causes, he says: "We have had a carnival of sentimentalism about the criminal and the law-breaker. Some of our zealots have presented more laws of restraint and interference, and merely added unnecessary personal prohibitions, certain to be broken, so that they make law-breaking even more wide-spread. Some of our doctors have deluded us into the idea that all crime is caused by adenoids or gland abnormality, so that any criminal can regard himself merely as a very sick man. Some of our alienists and psychopathic experimenters have made it possible for every highwayman's lawyer and every murderer's old mother to talk about the 'unfortunate abnormality of my client' or 'the complex which has seized my poor boy's mind.'

"The amusing side of all this is that this kind of 'scientific treatment' of the causes of our crime, though it gives to our criminals endless comfort, also gives them endless amusement." Mr. Child adds in qualification of this indictment, "I do not wish to be understood as decrying the attempts made by science, medicine, the psychiatrists, and the churches to diagnose and cure whatever physical, mental, or spiritual ailment is suffered by individuals. The work is an important one, and over long periods will yield useful insight and methods of treatment. But let no citizen of the United States who sees lawlessness as it is, the menace to our institutions and our youth, as lawlessness promises to be, stop just now to fool around with adenoids, complexes, and the other misfortunes which have afflicted the man who has just shot the cashier and beaten the face of the stenographer with the butt of his pistol." (Richard Washburn Child, *Battling the Criminal*, pp. 32-34.)

Mr. Child numbers among the causes of our high record of crime that we have taken in a stream of criminal material from nations where the climate, the racial background or centuries of oppression have provided explosive, passionate, or sneaky natures.

He cites the case of a cadaverous young man in an all-night lunch room, filled with criminals, sneaks, heroin users, and painted girls, of foreign birth or blood. A detective entered and insisted on taking away from the young man a concealed automatic. Whereupon the young fellow's girl companion, not more than sixteen years old, half-clad and cerised of lips, arose in indignation, and with her brown eyes filled with vicious lights, and in a cracked piping soprano of anger, snarled, "Leave him alone! He's a hundred percent American now. Ain't this a free country? Can't we do what we like? My father's got his citizenship. If I had the gun I'd blow yer eyes out, officer or no officer! Liberty? Liberty, my foot!" Mr. Child witnessed this himself, and he says her voice was speaking for thousands and thousands of others and expressing the essence of foreign misconception of America. (*Battling the Criminal*, pp. 37-38.)

The presence of this class of foreigners lays a tremendous task and responsibility on our statesmen and lawmakers, in the problems of immigration and assimilation, and on the Church in the problems of evangelisation and Christian nurture.

Dr. Max P. Schlapp, Professor of Neuropathology at the Post Graduate Hospital and Chairman of the Medical Board of the New York Children's Courts, says, from the point of view of a specialist: "We are headed for a smash in this country if we keep on going the way we are going. There is a curve in the emotional stability of every people which is an index of their growth and power as a nation. On the up swing the nation expands and gains in power with the normal development of emotional life. Then comes a time when emotional instability sets in. When it reaches a certain point there is a collapse. We have almost reached that point. This instability causes crime, feeble-mindedness, insanity. . . . Our emotional instability is the product of immigration, jazz and the movies. Foreigners who have come to America have left a peaceful, orderly life without any particular emotional shock, and have been plunged into a nervous maelstrom. A mere uprooting of their former lives is enough to cause considerable emotional disturbance, but this is heightened by the enormous increase in the nervous stimulation and shock of American life. It is bad enough for Americans, but far worse for those who have not grown used to it."

Dr. Kirchway, another specialist, says that it is the case of a nation that has never grown up. "Both the legal self-sufficiency of the pioneer and his dependence on fire-arms are still dominant traits of the American people. We are still, like our frontier forbears, content to live dangerously, to take our chances on getting away with our lives and our property. Our criminal procedure will be reformed when as a people we shall have acquired those qualities which make for law observance and law enforcement, and when that time comes we shall find that our crime rate will have fallen to the lower level of other civilised countries. To put it in a nut-shell, we shall be a law-enforcing people when we have become a law-abiding people and not before."

"Every hour of every day in the United States," says Judge Kavanagh, "some poor human being falls dying under the hands of an assassin. Three times every hour the dwelling or building of some person is broken into by a thief; five times every hour some one fronts the deadly pistol of a robber. There is nothing in the civilised world to compare with this shameful condition. There never was a civilised nation in all history so disgraced and afflicted.

"What is the matter with us?

"If one with premeditation commits a murder in the United States and is careful, the chances are six to one he will never be arrested, twelve to one he will never be convicted, and a hundred and twenty to one he will never die for his crime. . . . If we do away with the death penalty what shall we substitute? The nation has almost done away with the death penalty, and yet life imprisonment hasn't stayed the cruel hand." (Marcus

Kavanagh, *The Criminal and His Allies*, pp. 279-280.)

Judge Kavanagh quotes the great criminologist Garofalo in regard to the experience of the principal European Countries. "In every one of the thickly populated Countries of Europe, wherever the gallows was taken down, at once the murderer leaped exultantly and undeterred into the foreground of the picture. Whenever the death penalty, though not abolished, was unwisely diminished, the red crime increased in almost exact proportion as the danger of that punishment disappeared. He shows this to have been the case in Spain, Belgium, France, Italy, Prussia and Switzerland. . . . In Switzerland after the abolition of the death penalty, homicides in five years increased seventy-five percent." (Ibid., p. 281.)

Chief-Justice Taft in his address before the National Conference on the Reduction of Crime, held in Washington, Nov. 3, 1927, declared that "the general interests of the people have been forgotten in failing to make our criminal procedure such that accused persons may be promptly tried, and if guilty, convicted and punished.

"We are all in favour, of course, of measures which will induce criminals to become law-abiding citizens but we must never forget that the chief and first object of prosecution of crime is its deterrent effect upon future would-be criminals in the protection of society.

"We must not allow our interest in criminals to go to the point of making effective prosecution of crime and its punishment subordinate to schemes for reform of criminals, however admirable they may be." (Quoted in *The New York Times*, Nov. 4, 1927.)

In a speech at the Civic Reform in 1908, Mr. Taft is reported as saying: "The administration of the criminal law in the United States is a disgrace to civilisation. The prevalence of crime and fraud is due largely to the failure of the law and its administration to bring criminals to justice. The trial of a criminal seems like a game of chance with all the chances in favour of the criminal, and if he escapes he seems to have the sympathy of a sporting public."

The committee on Law Enforcement of the American Bar Association confirm what Justice Taft has said. In their report they contrast criminal procedure in the United States with that in England and France, and find that "our system lacks the three great essentials of law enforcement —celerity, certainty and finality." A comparison of records shows that the man who plans to commit a burglary in New York, for instance, knows, if he is anything of a statistician, that he has thirteen chances to one of escaping the penalty of his crime. But the English crook has only one-tenth of one chance to escape.

These and other considerations may account in part for the fact that we have become, as President Hoover solemnly declares, the most lawless of nations claiming to be civilised.

But deeper than defects in our legislation, and *in some measure the very cause of these defects,* lies our failure to recognise that civil government is an ordinance of God, and that we are commanded by the Supreme Lawgiver to be subject to the constituted authority of the state "for the Lord's sake" (I Pet. 2:13), and that to resist the power that He has delegated to the civil magistrate is to resist His will. (Romans 13:2.) "*The fear of the Lord* is the beginning of wisdom." "Knowing *the fear of the Lord,*" says Paul, "we persuade men." (II Cor. 5:11.)

Of course those who enact, those who interpret, and those who execute the laws, are responsible primarily to the Supreme Lawgiver, Judge and Ruler, for the spirit and manner in which they perform their solemn tasks. Justice and the best interests of the people are the ends they must keep in view, in the fear of the Lord, and with faith in Him for wisdom to direct. They are to be reminded that God sits supreme among the judges and makes inquisition, "How long will ye judge unjustly and respect the persons of the wicked." (Ps. 82:1-2.)

Whilst those defects and failures in legislation and procedure to which Justice Taft calls attention in some measure explain, they do not excuse nor palliate our lawlessness as a people. On the contrary, as already intimated, they make the case against us all the worse. For these defects and failures find their ultimate source *in the people themselves.* A government of the people and by the people, as ours claims to be, can be no better than the people. "Like people, like priest!" exclaimed the ancient prophet. (Hosea 4:9.) In the equilibrium of Church and State among the Hebrews under the Mosaic law, the priest was a civil as well as ecclesiastical officer. (Deut. 17:8-13; Mal. 2:7-9.) And it is as true today as it was of old, that the officers of government, who come from the people, who are the products of the prevailing civilisation and morality to which the people have attained, can hardly be expected to rise above the standards that produced them. "Like people, like priest!" The laws under which a people live, and the agents of the law, will reflect pretty accurately the general character of the people themselves. This text is often misquoted, as if it read, "Like priest, like people." Of course the people and their official representatives interact in their influence on each other. So that there is truth both in the text and in its misquotation. But as the people are the ultimate source, the chief responsibility for the character of laws and of lawmakers rests on them.

In considering the lawlessness of our people, it is not a theory, but a condition, that confronts us. This lawlessness is a palpable and stubborn fact and must be faced as such.

Senator Borah has stated the issue with great clarity and force: "Who wants to be considered," says he, "a slacker in the most sublime task ever undertaken in the affairs of government—that of demonstrating that a people may govern themselves, govern under established law and in the spirit of regulated liberty? . . . Forget for a moment that the Eighteenth Amendment covers the question of prohibition, and think of it only as a part of the Charter under which we live and to which we owe allegiance and support, and how plain the duty of every individual and of every state appears. If some one thinks the Eighteenth Amendment is unwise, and desires to come out before the American people and advocate taking it out of the Constitution, neither you nor I can criticise him; that is a right which he has. But so long as it is there written, so long as it is a part of it, the question of state rights can have no bearing when the question of enforcement is up for consideration. . . . If I were going to inscribe a banner under which to arouse the dispirited and discouraged millions of brave and loyal citizens, I would precede all other inscriptions with that of *obedience to law because it is law.*" (*Christianity and Social Adventuring*, Jerome Davis, pp. 14-18.)

In the same speech Senator Borah says, "The Churches of America need to support the great basic principles for which Christ lived and died. . . . Ministers need to pioneer in creating a civic conscience which will create social righteousness."

May it not be that the Church, in emphasising the duty of rendering unto God the things that are God's, sometimes fails to inculcate in due measure the obligation of rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's? And, inasmuch as God enjoins obedience to Caesar are we not in overlooking or minimising this obligation failing after all to render unto God the things that are God's? Is it possible for a man to be a good Christian and at the same time a slack and indifferent citizen?

The principles of good citizenship, which are the principles of politics in the larger sense, are embedded in the Scriptures, and are part of "the whole counsel of God," which the Church is commissioned to proclaim. Senator Borah's statement clearly implies the limits within which the Church may properly deal with politics. "The Churches," says he, "need to support *the great basic principles*," of citizenship and "ministers need to pioneer in *creating a civic conscience which will create social righteousness.*"

Has the Church's support of these principles been as positive and direct as it should have been? Have ministers been pioneers, with vision and initiative, in creating that civic conscience which alone can create social righteousness? If not, then we may well ask whether responsibility for prevailing lawlessness does not lie in part at ecclesiastical doors.

When Mr. Hoover took the oath of office at his inauguration as President of the United States, he chose as the text on which to place his hand, Proverbs 29:18: "Where there is no vision the people cast off restraint, but he that keepeth the law happy is he." Is it not the function of the Church to bring vision to the people, to warn them against the sin of casting off restraint, and to teach them that respect for lawful authority is an indispensable condition of happiness for an individual or a nation? And should not her ministers lift up their voice like a trumpet to proclaim, as did the prophets of old, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." (Proverbs 14:34.)

"Hon. James W. Good, lamented Secretary of War, in President Hoover's Cabinet, in a recent public address, spoke clearly and most earnestly in favour of law observance, as distinguished from law enforcement. Law observance is a personal matter, and shows the real character of a man. Law enforcement is the government's compelling a man to observe the law against his wish, or punishing him for its violation.

"Secretary Good said, among other things: 'I believe if the Church, and all the churches, could get behind a movement of voluntary law observance, there would be created a public sentiment that would mean more for law enforcement than the activities of an army of enforcement officers. The churches can do a great deal to bring about a desire on the part of the ordinary citizen to do what he should do, and to a realisation that he is aiding in law breaking when he himself does those things which the Constitution and the law prohibits.

"'If a man has been leading a life of non-observance of the laws of the United States, I have little sympathy for him, but I am heartily sorry for his family upon whom he brings down disaster. We cannot have a good administration of law if our better class of citizens do not observe the law. I am sorry to say that, in some instances, the non-observance of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act is not confined to the social outcast and the derelict, but it has been associated with the substantial citizen, thus giving it a degree of respectability. In many instances these law violators are church-going men, and women, too, for it is not confined to men alone. If there can be created a public sentiment in favour of law enforcement, the organisation that brings it about will have done the country an immeasurable service.'" (*Presbyterian of the South*, October 9, 1929.)

We may well ask whether the Church, in the present lapse of obedience to law on the part of many who are under her discipline, fully recognise her solemn duty to "reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching." (II Tim. 4:2.)

One of the most ominous signs of the times in the matter of lawlessness is the rapid increase of crime among the young people of the land. The Governor of North Carolina made an address before the State Baptist Convention last November in which he called attention to this wide-spread and alarming condition. He brought no sweeping indictment against the youth of today. He declared that many of them are facing life and its problems with an open-minded sincerity that has probably never been equalled by any former generation.

"But there is something wrong somewhere," said he, "and at present I am inclined to lay the responsibility at the doors of the home and the church. We have had an enormous increase in crime and delinquency in this State during the past five years, and from statistics gathered as to this condition, two facts stand out with an emphasis that cannot but challenge attention. In the first place, 65 percent of the increase in the population of our State penal and correctional institutions is made up of young white men and boys, there being noted over the same period a falling off in the number of coloured youth offenders.

"In the second place, the vast majority of these young men—Mr. George Ross Pou, Superintendent of the State's Prison, places the estimate at 80 percent—have never finished the sixth grade and have never regularly attended any church or Sunday School. In other words, our prisons are being over-run by a class of criminals hitherto comparatively rare in this State, and who, so far as their home and religious training is concerned, have been permitted to approach maturity almost as pagans. . . . The Christian Church places great value upon human life and personality. It has indeed been said that this is its greatest contribution to the civilisation of the race. Crime represents a negation of life and freedom and happiness. Its terrible consequences are felt as a blight on the innocent no less than the guilty. It is this appalling wastage in vital human resources and potentialities and the seemingly direct connection between its prevention and the work of the Church that has impressed me and caused me to conclude that here is the Church's greatest task and challenge for the immediate future." (Address of Gov. O. Max Gardner before the State Baptist Convention at Shelby, N. C., Nov. 12, 1929, as reported in the *Asheville Citizen*, Nov. 13, 1929.)

Is not this a challenge which should ring in the ears and hearts of us all, but which should come as an irresistible appeal to young men who are preparing for the gospel ministry? Youth calls to youth through subtle instinctive channels of influence which muffle the voices of older men.

Judge Kavanagh calls attention to an organisation functioning under the auspices of the Church of England, which is doing a work of incalculable value. It is known as the Prisoners' Aid. "In every large city of that country the agents of that society each morning go down into the cells of the police stations to interview the prisoners arrested during the day or night previous and who are to come before the magistrate. These agents go as the friends, helpers and protectors of the unfortunate. The truant boy or girl who has got into a little trouble is helped to go home. The prisoner, who, tempted by need or by sudden passion, for the first time has broken the law, finds a friend and protector. . . . Even the old offender finds in these agents a sympathetic listener and often a protector. There is no attempt to shield the prisoner from just punishment, when punishment is needed, but even after and during punishment the society keeps in touch with its wards." (*The Criminal and His Allies*, p. 372.)

Why should not the Churches of the United States organise Prisoners' Aid Societies, to do the same kind of work? If "from heaven Jehovah beholds the earth, to hear the sighing of the prisoner," (Ps. 102:19), should not His people do more, not to shield the guilty, but to comfort and guide the unfortunate, and to point even the chief of sinners to Him who came to save the lost? The good Earl of Shaftesbury gave much of his time and energy to work of this kind, and reaped an abundant reward in the many wayward ones who, through the touch of his personal sympathy and aid, were restored to paths of right living.

IV. *There still remains the question whether disobedience to the law of the land is ever justifiable.*

We are commanded to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's. But suppose there is a conflict of authority and Caesar commands what God forbids, or forbids what God commands. In such a case it is evident that the authority which is original, inherent, and underived, over-rides and annuls the authority that is delegated.

Thomas Hobbes in the *Leviathan* taught as over against Bishop Butler's doctrine of the authority of conscience, that the state is supreme, and that the civil ruler is to be obeyed under all conditions. If he commands us to do wrong, the responsibility for the wrong we do is his not ours. Hobbes carries this to the extreme point of teaching that if the sovereign should command a subject to worship an idol, the subject would not be wrong in doing so, for in this case the sovereign and not the subject would be violating the second commandment in the decalogue by making the graven image.

Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego thought otherwise, though threatened with the fiery furnace. "O Nebuchadnezzar," said they, "we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace; and he will deliver us out of thy hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." (Daniel, Chapter 3.)

And so the Apostles when forbidden to teach no more in the name of Jesus replied, "We must obey God rather than men." And when beaten for their disobedience, they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonour for the Name. And every day in the temple and at home, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ. (Acts, Chapter 5.)

It is not likely that we of this generation, will have to meet such tests as tried the faith and courage of the three young Hebrews in Babylon or the Apostles in Jerusalem. But the principle on which they acted that we must obey God rather than men, has by no means gone into "innocuous desuetude." If we are to be loyal to it, we must sometimes stand against public opinion and the frowns of society. If the test should come, "O God, may grace to us be given to follow in their train!"

The general duty of obedience to properly constituted government involves also the question of revolution, whether it is ever right to overthrow the existing government and establish another. Is the *de facto* government always a government *de jure*? In teaching that civil government is ordained of God, the Scriptures teach that it is God's will and ordinance that men should live together under a condition of law and order. Government is not an end in itself, but means to an end. The end of more importance than the means. If then an existing government defeats the end of government as ordained of God for the maintenance of justice, for the protection and co-ordination of individual rights and interests, it is evident that the existing government may and should be overthrown in the very interests of government in the true sense.

Is not this the basis of the prophet's words: "And thou, O deadly wounded wicked one, the prince of Israel, whose day is come in the time of the iniquity of the end, thus saith the Lord Jehovah: Remove the mitre, and take off the crown; this shall be no more the same; exalt that which is low, and abase that which is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: this also shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him." (Ezekiel 21:25-27.)

Revolutions, like other human movements, are not free from evils of various sorts. The French Revolution, beginning as a revolt against tyranny and oppression, ended in a reign of terror.

But it cannot be questioned or denied that Freedom has made her longest and swiftest flights on the wings of Revolution.

# V

# SUNDAY LAWS AND LIBERTY

THE title of this lecture will suggest the trend and limits of the discussion. It is to Sunday as a civil and not as a Christian institution that I shall address myself. I shall touch on the ecclesiastical and religious phases of the subject only in so far as I conceive that the civil government has any proper concern with Sunday as a day of worship. I shall have little to say of what may or may not be right or wrong in the abstract in the manner of observing the day, or of how our conduct may affect ourselves individually and personally. I am thinking now of the interest the human race has in the day as a beneficent institution, established by our Creator for the general welfare of mankind. Proper and legitimate Sunday laws will not aim at restraining or abridging the liberty of the individual, except in so far as the restraint or abridgement of that liberty is necessary for the protection of the rights and privileges of others. The same is true of all restrictive legislation in every sphere of human conduct. You will see at once, therefore, that the question is not one of theological technicalities, nor of theoretical or transcendental morals, but one of practical human rights and social order. I dwell on this because when Sunday legislation is proposed, there are some who raise the cry of "blue laws." Ex-Governor Folk, of Missouri, once said that all laws look blue to the man who wants to break them, to the man whose chief end is to do as he pleases without regard to the rights of his fellow-man. Others, upon the first mention of Sunday laws, close their ears to all arguments and cry out, "Puritanical Sabbath!" another ancient shibboleth that obscures and confuses the living, practical, humane issues involved in the protection of man's day of rest in this twentieth century of the Christian era.

It is true that the Sunday laws of the American colonies were very rigid, requiring attendance at church and enforcing other religious observances. But these laws, in the first place, existed in all the colonies—among the Huguenots of South Carolina, and the Cavaliers of Virginia, as well as among the Puritans of New England. In Virginia, for instance, under the influence of the established church of the Cavalier colony, the law imposed a fine of two pounds of tobacco for every failure to attend the Sunday services of the church, besides a fine of twenty pounds for a month's absence. This Virginia law was enacted in 1617, three years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth. And, in the second place, the law requiring church attendance had its origin in a statute of Charles II, who was anything but a Puritan, and whose reign was anything but an era of Puritanism.

The truth of the matter is all the colonists brought their Sunday laws with them across the seas, laws that originated in the countries from which they came. At that time union of church and state prevailed. No discrimination was made between the purely religious and the secular and humane aspects of Sunday observances, and the civil government undertook to enforce worship as well as cessation from labour and sports. It was chiefly through the influence of the churches, (or some of them,) that separation of church and state was formally declared in the federal constitution and in the several state constitutions. Provisions of a purely religious character were thereby eliminated from the statutes as lying outside the sphere of civil authority. The present issue is not a return to that hybrid legislation. None desire it; least of all, the churches that fought and won the battle for religious liberty.

The "blue laws" and the "Puritanical Sabbath" are therefore dead issues. We shall not be prepared to face the issue of today with honest eyes and an open mind until we have duly labelled these ancient relics of our ancestors and shelved them in the museum of antique curios along with

> *"Cages for gnats and chains to yoke a flea.*
> *Dried butterflies and tomes of casuistry."*

What, then, is the living issue in the question of Sunday legislation? After the purely religious features of the Sabbath were turned over to the church, where they belong, there remained the question of the weekly rest day as affecting the physical, social, industrial and political well being of mankind. "The Sabbath was made for man," just as property-rights, marriage, the family, etc., were made for man—not for man as white, or black, or yellow, or brown, not for man as Jew, or Mohammedan or Christian, but for man, without distinction of colour, or race, or religion—not for man the individual, but for the *genus homo.* Thus the Sabbath, with its God-given right of rest and its God-given opportunity of worship, called for the protection of the civil power, which God ordained for the very purpose of insuring to every man the enjoyment of his natural rights. Hence emerged the distinction between the Sabbath as a purely religious institution and the Sabbath as a civil institution, a distinction which has been clearly recognised from the foundation of our government to the present time, in legislative enactments and judicial decisions. These enactments and decisions rest on the broad principle enunciated by Blackstone in his "Commentaries" (B. IV c. 63.) as follows:

"Besides the notorious indecency and scandal of permitting any secular business to be publicly transacted on that day, in a country professing Christianity, and the corruption of morals which usually follow its profanation, the keeping of one day in seven holy, as a time for relaxation and refreshment as well as for public worship, is of admirable service to a state, considered merely as a civil institution. It harmonises by the help of conversation and society the manners of the lower classes, which would otherwise degenerate into a sordid ferocity and savage selfishness of spirit; it enables the industrious workman to resume his occupation in the ensuing week with health and cheerfulness; it imprints on the mind of the people that sense of duty to God so necessary to make them good citizens, but which yet would be worn out and defaced by an unremitted continuance of labour without any stated times of recalling them to the worship of their Maker."

In the language of the late Mr. Justice Strong, of the United States Supreme Court, "There is abundant justification for our Sabbath laws, regarding them as mere civil institutions, which they are, and he is no friend to the good order and welfare of society who would break them down, or who himself sets an example of disobedience to them." (*New York Sabbath Committee*, Doc. No. 45, p. 6.)

"All the States of the United States," says Nelson's Encyclopedia, "have statutes relating to the Sabbath. The State does not recognise the religious character of the day as such, but enforces its observance on the theory that one day's rest in seven is necessary for the physical and moral well-being of its citizens. This is constitutional as a valid exercise of the police power." (Nelson's Loose-Leaf Encyclopedia, under *Sunday Laws*.)

This, then, is the living issue. Shall the Sabbath, involving interests that belong to man as man and the good order and welfare of society, be protected by the arm of law, or shall the civil power stand by and see these interests sacrificed on the altars of pleasure and of greed? These altars stand side by side. Let the Sabbath be turned into a day of public amusement, and what is the result? The pleasure-seeker for pleasure's sake, and those who minister to pleasure-seekers for gain, combine against the wage earner, forcing him to work seven days in the week, for the amusement of those "on pleasure bent" and for the gain of those who "have a frugal mind." No one has so much to fear from the wide open Sunday as the working man. It makes him a slave with no better prospect for his children, and his children's children. This is what the great historian, Henry Hallam, meant, when he declared, "A holiday Sabbath has always been the ally of despotism," adding that European despotic rulers have cultivated a love of pastime on Sundays in order that the people might be more quiet under political oppression. (W. F. Crafts, *The Sabbath for Man*, pp. 195, 266.) A holiday Sabbath for some means a work-a-day Sabbath for some others, and the second class grows in numbers with the first. It is a case in which both those who are greedy of pleasure and of gain should be made "to keep their feet out of the trough." It is the function of the civil power to see that this is done.

It has been estimated that there are 3,000,000 wage-earners in the United States who are forced by our present economic and industrial system to work seven days every week. These range in occupation from the boy who stands at the soda water fountain to the locomotive engineer in his cab. Are these millions of our fellow citizens to be robbed of their weekly rest and of the liberty and opportunity to worship God in His holy temple, while we in our religious complacency, like the priest and the levite on the way to the temple, pass by on the other side as if it were no concern of ours? Nay, should we not consider whether we may not even be numbered by Him who declared that He is Lord of the Sabbath, among the band of robbers who stripped the poor traveller and left him wounded by the wayside?

Have we not exercised ourselves too much with questions as to what things are in themselves right or wrong for us to do on Sunday, and too little with the question:—What bearing have our Sunday acts and habits on the welfare and rights of our fellowmen?

We blame the Puritan for seeming to determine his conduct by the question how he could make himself and others sufficiently miserable on Sunday. Are we any better if we determine ours by the question: How can I enjoy and indulge myself on this day to my heart's content, at the expense of my fellowmen's weariness and sweat? The much abused Puritan was at least serious and conscientious, however mistaken. Are we not in danger of becoming light and frivolous and selfish in our attitude to this whole subject—"neither fearing God nor regarding man"?

In order to bring the matter home to our own "business and bosoms," let me relate some pertinent incidents that have come under my own observation.

In the year 1905 the soda water fountains were first opened on Sunday in Asheville, my home town. The boys that served at these fountains unanimously signed a petition to the board of aldermen not to shut them up to the alternative of having either to work seven days in the week or throw up their jobs. In the discussion that followed the issue was confused by an attempt, and, I am sorry to say, a successful attempt, to make it turn on the rightness or wrongness of drinking soda water on Sunday, whereas it really turns on the rightness or wrongness of requiring these boys to work seven days in the week in order to gratify somebody's desire for that which is merely a luxury and not a necessity.

The same confusion of issues has arisen on the question of the Sunday newspaper. When one of our papers began several years ago to issue a Sunday edition, two or three of the boys who had been carrying the paper gave up their jobs rather than work on Sunday morning. These were boys whose wages were needed to supplement the family income. The mother of one of these boys told me that when he went to the business manager to hand in his resignation, the manager commended him for it and told him that he would be better and happier all his life if he would stick to this resolution.

Several years ago a reporter on one of our local papers (a communicant of the Episcopal church), said to me, in regard to my position against the Sunday newspaper, that I was everlastingly right as to the labour required to get out the Sunday issue. He said that by Saturday he was tired out by the work of the week and that the work for the Sunday paper, extending to the wee small hours of Saturday night, was the last straw; and he found it absolutely necessary to absent himself from the church services in order to spend a large part of Sunday in bed. Aside from the question of what a man ought or ought not to read on Sunday, with which the law has nothing to do, there is the large human issue of unnecessary work disqualifying thousands for the enjoyment of Sunday privileges.

These local cases will serve as samples of the great army of men, women, and children who work seven days in the week in the United States because our laws on this subject are too lax.

It would be well for our nation to learn from the experience of the older nations of Europe, of which practically all have within the last thirty years enacted laws protecting Sunday as a day of rest. "In the eighties and nineties of the 19th Century a stranger could hardly tell whether the day was Sunday or not. But at last the 'anti-clerical' governments, which had looked on complacently at a change which diminished religious observance, became aware that it was causing immense social mischief; while on behalf of the over-strained workers urgent claims were made for a legal day of rest. Between the years 1895 and 1910 laws were passed in almost every country of Europe to secure a weekly day of rest for every working man." (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. XII, p. 109.)

The history of Sunday legislation in France is specially pointed and instructive. As you know, the seventh day rest was at one time abolished in that country, and every tenth day substituted for it; and even after the seventh day was restored, its observance as a day of rest was far from satisfactory. When the French statesman and publicist, De Tocqueville, visited this country in 1831, nothing so excited his wonder or impressed him so favourably as the quiet American Sunday of that time—a century ago. You will find his remarks on this subject in his "*Democracy in America.*" Among other things, he declared France must have the American Sabbath or she is ruined. It took France a long time to learn her lesson. A few years ago France was fast becoming a decadent nation; the death rate was exceeding the birth rate and there were other symptoms of national decay. In 1870, her army was as chaff before the wind in her war with Prussia. In 1905, a special commission was appointed by the government to make an investigation. The commission, after a year spent in study of the question reported that one of the causes of decay was the long neglect of one day's rest in seven; wherupon the chamber of deputies, by the remarkable vote of 575 to 1, passed a law requiring the observance of a weekly day of rest. This was done not at all out of religious considerations, but purely on the basis of social and industrial economics and national conservation. This law is compulsory, both as to employer and employee. All corporations and business concerns are required to give their employees twenty-four consecutive hours of rest every week; such work as seems unnecessary is forbidden on Sunday; and in the case of necessary labour, such as in hotels and restaurants, telephone exchanges, and necessary Sunday travel, the law requires that some other day during the week be granted by the employer and observed by the employee. And, furthermore, that one-third of the rest days in the case of each of these employees shall fall on Sunday. The *Wall Street Journal* commented at the time on this action of the French government, as follows:

"From the extreme of Puritan ideas we have in a few years moved rapidly to the opposite pole, of what has been perhaps erroneously termed the continental Sabbath, a Sabbath in which religious observances have been more and more ignored and the day given up to pleasure. The laxity of Sunday observance has resulted in increasing the labour of vast numbers in order to provide for the pleasure of the multitude. In other words, the day, instead of being a day of rest and worship, is becoming very largely a day of exhausting pleasures and work.

"The action of the French chamber of deputies suggests the idea that it may be necessary in this country to protect the right of every toiler to one day's rest out of seven, and not only to protect him in that right but to compel him to exercise it, so that if he is obliged to work on Sunday he shall at least take some other day of the week for rest. Undoubtedly the country is the strongest and most enduring when its population as a whole devotes one day in seven to wholesome rest and worship. It may be said that many of the rich who have the command of every day in the week are setting a bad example of devoting Sunday to forms of pleasure that compel less fortunate people to work."

Switzerland was the first European country to require one day's rest in seven for every labourer on railway and trolley lines. This was done in the year 1900. At the end of the first twelve months the report showed a whole year without a single fatal accident on railway or trolley. In 1906 the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States reported that there had been on an average during the preceding eleven years nearly forty accidents daily on railroads alone, and an average of twenty persons killed every day of the year. The total in that period was 84,244 fatal accidents, and 555,585 cases of injury more or less serious. (*Report of American Sabbath Union*, 1906.)

In July 1906 the Dominion of Canada passed the Lord's Day Act, which has been declared "the most satisfactory piece of legislation on the subject in existence."

Dr. Charles Herbert Huestis, Secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance of Canada, says of it:

"It differs from most English law for Sunday observance by its entire avoidance of the question of the religious use of the day, its aim being directed at Sunday business and labour. It prohibits all buying and selling and all exercise by a man of his ordinary vocation or calling, either by himself or his employees, on the Lord's Day, except in cases of necessity and mercy. It forbids competitive games played in public for a prize or reward, and entertainments where a fee is charged, directly or indirectly, either for admission or for any service or privilege thereat. It grants to employees in continuous industries, transportation, telephone and telegraph services, one day of rest in seven; though this section does not apply to any employee engaged in the work of any industrial process in which the regular day's labour of such employee is not more than eight hours' duration. It forbids the sale of newspapers on Sunday, and Sunday shooting, either for gain or in such a manner as to disturb the quiet of the day. It expressly permits any work of necessity or mercy and gives a considerable catalogue of ordinary works of that character; though the permission is not restricted to these forms of work." (Charles H. Huestis, *Sunday in the Making*, pp. 147-148.)

You will note that the Canadian law, while not forbidding entertainments and games on Sunday, prohibits those in which "a fee is charged, directly or indirectly, either for admission or for any service or privilege thereat." Under this law, for instance, Sunday golf is forbidden only when a fee is paid for the privilege of playing or for the services of a caddie. All commercialised games are eliminated, such as baseball or football where an admission fee is charged. These prohibitions are in line with the general purpose of the law, to make Sunday as far as possible a day of rest for all the people, in the interests of public welfare. It is very properly implied in this that the state has no right to restrict individual liberty except to protect the liberty of others or for the general good.

Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of *The Christian Century*, after a recent visit to Canada, wrote as follows:

"They have a real Sunday in Canada. Accustomed as I have long been to our pagan first day of the week in the United States, I had almost forgotten that it was possible for an entire national community to lay aside most of its work and all its commercialised pleasure and devote itself to the pursuits of religion and the quiet enjoyment of recreation and pleasure under forms of voluntary self-expression. No Sunday papers are published in Canada.

"The effect of the institutionalised Sunday is naturally to create a disposition to attend worship. The distractions of the day are reduced to a minimum. There is, of course, no compulsion or external constraint about church attendance, but people's thoughts and their steps turn more easily toward the church than in our American society.

"I am impressed, too, with the mood in which they come. When one faces a Canadian congregation he feels that they are already in the spirit of worship. I always suspect, as I look into the faces of an American congregation, that most of the worshippers had but a few moments previously reluctantly dropped the Sunday paper and 'beat it' as fast as they could to the church. I often wonder what images of cartoon, or murder tale, or stock market operations, or scandal, or politics, are flitting in and out of their minds while they endeavour to concentrate on the worship of God.

"This is not saying that Canadians are naturally more religious than Americans, but it is to say that they give themselves a better opportunity to get the good out of their religion—and to put their best into it.

"When the worship begins, it 'goes' with zest. The people's thoughts are on tiptoe. It is worth going to Canada just to hear their congregational singing. Canadians sing noble hymns. Canadian congregations know their hymns. They are not better singers than we are, they are no more lyrical or poetic in their temperament. Their minds are more at home in the lore of religion—the Scriptures, the hymn book and the creeds—than are our minds.

"In my judgment if there is any single factor which accounts for the unfavourable disparity between Canadians and Americans in the art and practice of worship it is the break-down of the Sabbath in America.

"I have come home determined to study the question of recovering for American life this breathing space for the spirit. I have certainly been shaken free of that complacent acceptance of our pagan Sunday which characterises the minds of most of us.

"In Canada I understand they centre their policy upon the principle of a non-commercial Sunday. Under this principle the publication of newspapers and the operation of amusements, whether theatrical or athletic, for pay are banned. Thus the more hectic pleasures are removed from the scene.

"I wish we could recover our lost American Sabbath, but I do not like to see the question raised as though it were merely a religious problem. It is a cultural problem, a human welfare problem, and if it could be pressed in terms of human welfare, I cannot help believing that many who have no interest in the religious uses of recognised Sabbath day would join with religious people in erecting again such an institution in our social order."

This statement is very significant as coming from the editor of a paper that among conservatives is counted as leaning decidedly towards liberalism.

The provision in the French law compelling observance by employees as well as employers is wise and right. Otherwise the practical effect of the law is thwarted by the offer and acceptance of increased pay for Sunday work. John Stuart Mill declares that labouring men ought to remember that "if there were no Sunday rest, seven days' work would have to be given for six days' pay," (*Harvard Classics*, Vol. 25, p. 298) and Paley said long ago: "The addition of the seventh day's labour to that of the other six would have no other effect than to reduce the price." Besides, national efficiency and public safety (in the case of railway employees, for instance,) demand that employees rest. Accidents are multiplied by allowing men to work beyond a reasonable period without cessation.

The latest, and in some respects the most striking, example (1923) of a weekly rest-day law has been given by the Soviet Power in Russia. "In accordance with the animus of this Communist government against religion, the day selected is Monday: Friday, Saturday and Sunday being associated with religion by the Mohammedan, Jewish, and Christian nationals of that country respectively." (Charles Herbert Huestis, *Sunday in the Making*, p. 149.) Here we have the civil Sabbath recognised as something entirely distinct from the religious.

Thirty years ago the barber shops were open for business throughout the United States. When it was proposed to close them there was the usual outcry against infringing on personal liberty, the liberty of the man who wanted a shave on Sunday morning. But this man, according to the proneness of human nature, was thinking only of his own liberty, and not at all of the liberty of the barber.

About that time the Barber's Union started an agitation for a Sunday law compelling all shops to close on Sunday. By united action and with the aid of the organisations that have been established for the general protection of Sunday rest, they accomplished their purpose, and barber shops are now closed by law. The action of the barbers in asking for compulsory closing illustrates the well known maxim among Sunday reformers that *"the liberty of rest for each depends on a law of rest for all."*

In a Connecticut town some years ago there was a movement inaugurated by the barbers to have all the barber shops closed on Sunday. "All right," said a young enterprising fellow, "you go right on and shut your shops. Never mind me." And so all the shops had to be kept open. (W. F. Crafts, *The Sabbath for Man,* p. 207.)

The following incident accords with the same maxim: A short time ago a business man requested me to exert myself to get a law passed requiring him to suspend his business on Sunday, as he desired to do, declaring at the same time that he could not do this and stay in the business, unless there was a general law applying to himself and his competitors. The only fair basis for exceptions is the provision made in the Sunday law of practically every State, that works of charity and necessity are alone exempt. It may be difficult at times to determine just where the line of necessity should be drawn, and it will vary with varying circumstances, but it is a sound principle, and if particular exceptions are made outside of charity and necessity, it is easy to see that there is an unfair discrimination in favour of some lines of business as against others. If one unnecessary business is allowed to run, why not all? The Sunday laws of the State of New York, 1909-1910, give the following definition: "In works of necessity or charity is included whatever is needful during the day for the good order, health and comfort of the community."

As to the maxim, "The liberty of rest for each depends on a law of rest for all," John Stuart Mill in his famous essay, "Our Liberty," writes: "Without doubt, abstinence on one day of the week, so far as the exegencies of life permit, from the usual daily occupation, though in no respect religiously binding on any except Jews, is a highly beneficial custom. And inasmuch as this custom cannot be observed without a general consent to that effect among the industrial classes, therefore, in so far as some persons by working may impose the same necessity on others, it may be lawful and right that the law should guarantee to each the observance by others of the custom, by suspending the greater operations of industry on a particular day." (*Harvard Classics*, Vol. 25, p. 29.)

This is a significant concession on Mill's part, inasmuch as he was writing of "illegitimate interference with the rightful liberty of the individual in Sabbatarian legislation."

In the year 1911, a local agitation was begun for the closing of the general delivery window in the Asheville post office. Again, there was the same confusion of the true issue. Some persons claimed that it would be unreasonable to interfere with their getting and reading their mail on Sunday.

They seemed to be going on the assumption that those who favoured the closing were doing so on the ground that it was itself wrong for a man to go to the post office or read his letters on that day, whereas the real issue was on the right of the overworked postman to share with others the benefits of one day's rest in seven. It is needless to say that the postmen themselves were heartily in favour of the closing. I am glad to say that their plea was granted, and that only such work as seems necessary to prevent undue congestion of mail in post offices is now allowed on Sunday. Filed away among the papers that I most value is one containing resolutions passed by the postal employees of Asheville, thanking me for the little part I had in helping to obtain for them their liberty to enjoy the rest day, ordained by God for the welfare of mankind. And it has worked no hardship for others.

You will notice that there has been no effort whatever in any of these agitations for the enactment of Sunday laws to interfere with a man's religious convictions, or to bind him in any way in matter of creed or worship. The laws are intended to enforce rest, except in work of necessity and charity, on the ground that the public good and the welfare of the civil government and of human society depend on such enforcement. So far as religion is concerned, the aim of the law is simply to protect a man in the privileges of his religion, whatever that religion may be; or as the New York statute says, "the law prohibits the doing on that day of certain acts which are serious interruptions of the repose and religious liberty of the community." The object of Sunday laws is to secure to every person, so far as possible, the right to rest one day in seven; to the community the privilege of undisturbed worship on that day; and to the day itself that outward respect which may be deemed essential to the peace and good order of society.

Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. If by liberty is meant the right of the individual to do as he pleases, without regard to the rights of others and the welfare of society, then Sunday laws are foes of liberty. But if by liberty is meant equal opportunity for all, special privileges for none, and a system of just laws securing to each the rights and privileges that belong to all in common, then liberty has no better friend, and no more necessary friend, than fair and reasonable legislation, insuring to every worker one day's rest in seven and protecting the community from whatever destroys or disturbs the general repose of the day of rest and of worship.

# VI

# THE IDEAL AND THE PRACTICAL

FRANCIS BACON, in *The Wisdom of the Ancients*, relates the old story of Icarus as follows: "Icarus, being to fly across the sea, was ordered by his father neither to soar too high nor fly too low, for, as his wings were fastened together with wax, there was danger of its melting by the sun's heat in too high a flight, and of its becoming less tenacious by the moisture if he kept too near the vapour of the sea. But he with a juvenile confidence, soared aloft, and fell down headlong."

Bacon, commenting on the fable, says: "No wonder that excess (of courage) should prove the bane of Icarus, exulting in juvenile strength and vigour; for excess is the natural vice of youth, as defect is that of old age; and if a man must perish by either, Icarus chose the better of the two; for all defects are justly esteemed more depraved than excesses. There is some magnanimity in excess, that, like a bird, claims kindred with the heavens; but defect is a reptile, that basely crawls upon the earth." *(The Wisdom of the Ancients: XXVII.)*

This is a fable of the Ideal and the Practical, of freedom and restraint. The Ideal has wings and excess of courage in its flights. The Practical is quick, often too quick, to see perils and yield to the restraint of fear. As Bacon says, it is better to soar so high as to have the hinges of your wings dissolved by the heat of the sun than to fly so low as to have them disintegrated by the vapour that rises from the sea. The soaring Ideal is nobler than the grovelling Practical. An excess of freedom, if it be the adventure of a noble idealism, is better than too much restraint, if it be the fruit of timid utilitarianism, with an eye only to the main chance of safety or the risk of loss.

Ever since the sneer of Joseph's brethren at Dothan, "Behold this dreamer cometh," practical men have scoffed at the idealist. But as then, so often since has it come to pass, that in the end these same practical men have been obliged to adjust themselves to the dream and do obeisance to the dreamer whom they scorned.

This has been notably true in the world of mechanical invention. In his *"History of the People of the United States,"* McMasters writing of Arkwright's spinning jenny, says: "It was indeed with this at first, as with every great invention, from the alphabet to the printing press, from the printing press to the railroad, from the railroad to the telegraph. It was bitterly opposed." Of Robert Fulton's steamboat, the Clermont, he says: "Fulton met with the same opposition which in our time we have seen expended on the telegraph and sewing machine, and which, sometime in the future will be encountered by inventions and discoveries of which we have not the smallest conception. No man in his senses, it was asserted, would risk his life in such a *fire-boat* as the Clermont when the river was full of good packets." These packets moved at the rate of three or four miles per hour.

Five years after the experiment of the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk, N. C., in which they smashed the theory that a heavier-than-air flying machine was a scientific impossibility, a reporter for the *New York World* who wrote the story of that adventure, was suspended by his news editor as a Munchausen until his story could be verified.

Prof. Samuel P. Langley of the Smithsonian Institution, who had previously demonstrated the theory, is said to have died of a broken heart because of the ridicule that was heaped upon him, and the refusal of the government to make the grant of money necessary for completing his experiments.

The dreamers in statesmanship have fared little better at the hands of contemporaries than the dreamers in mechanics.

In 1791 Alexander Hamilton launched his plan for the Federal Bank. McMasters says that at that time there were only four banks in the United States, and that they were very unpopular institutions. "Some were deterred from making deposits by the recollection that their fathers had never done so before them, others by the strong antipathy which they felt for banks in general. The old way, they said, of doing business was good enough. If a man were prosperous and had cash to spare, the best place to keep it was in his own house, under his own lock and key." So with the great idealistic document, the Constitution of the United States. "It was with the greatest difficulty," says

Dr. Willard L. Sperry, "that it established itself in the face of the bitter hostility and dismal predictions which it aroused. It seems to have been regarded by the Anti-federalists of that day much as the Covenant of the League of Nations has been regarded by the great majority of Americans today, a useless and Utopian scheme. The criticisms visited upon it were precisely those which in our time have been passed upon the Covenant as an idealistic and impracticable scheme." (Willard L. Sperry, *The Disciplines of Liberty,* p. 88.) Even Alexander Hamilton expressed his despair of the practicability of establishing a republican form of government over so extensive a country; and this at a time when the area of the country was vastly smaller than it is today. (W. C. Rives, *Life and Times of James Madison.* Ch. 29.)

In every field of idealism the idealist has been met with the old gibe, "Behold this dreamer cometh!"

I do not wish to desiccate this lecture with too many definitions. A few sentences from Eucken's *"Main Currents of Modern Thought"* will suffice to indicate the meaning of "the ideal" and "the practical" as I propose to use these terms.

After tracing the history and development of the word "idealism," Eucken says, "It soon became possible for all those to call themselves idealists who maintained the superiority of spiritual activity over the forces of the external world." He quotes from a letter of Schiller to Humboldt: "After all, we are both idealists and would be ashamed to have it said of us that *things shaped us and not we the things.*"

And again he quotes F. A. Wolf as saying, "The direction of the spirit towards the ideal is the first condition of all higher developments. It is not fitting for free and magnanimous souls to be always seeking after the useful" (*Main Currents of Modern Thought*, pp. 101-102). The realm of idealism is a realm of true values, but of values that are measured by spiritual standards instead of by the yardstick and avoirdupois of "the practical man."

The materialist is impatient for results. He demands of life that it "deliver the goods." The idealist on the other hand can wait——

*"Can so forecast the years*
*To find in loss a gain to match,*
*And reach a hand thro' time to catch*
*The far-off interest of tears."*

He looks not at the seen, which is temporal, but at the unseen, which is eternal.

A system of philosophy has recently come into vogue called *pragmatism*, pragmatism being only another name for *the practical*. According to this system, or *method*, as Prof. Wm. James, its high priest, prefers to call it, the test of what is true and right is found solely in the practical results. "On pragmatical principles," says he, "if the hypothesis (of God) works satisfactorily in the widest sense of the word, it is true." Of course, this means, if it doesn't work it isn't true. "The true," says he, "is only the expedient, in the way of our thinking, just as the right is only the expedient, in the way of our behaviour." (*Pragmatism*, p. 222.)

"Notwithstanding the stimulating power of such a movement," says Eucken, "supported as it is by brilliant and distinguished thinkers, we are compelled to regard it, when considered as a whole and *in its ultimate bearings*, as an error. The powerful impression produced by pragmatism is due, in the first place, to the fact that it reverses the conventional way of looking at things. *But what if*, in the process, the idea of truth itself is reversed and ends by standing on its head?" (*Main Currents of Modern Thought*, pp. 77-78.) Eucken's figure of truth turned topsy-turvy by pragmatism is a picturesque exposure of the fallacy. A thing is not true or right because its results are experienced as satisfactory, but in the idealist's view the results will be satisfactory in the long run because the thing is true or right.

We may indeed test what is alleged to be true and right by its results, provided we know what the final and complete results will be, and provided we can appraise those results at their true value; but that is a very different thing from saying that the results *make* the thing true and right, or false and wrong, as the case may be.

As Dr. Gaius Glenn Atkins puts it, "Pragmatism, affirming that whatever *works* is true, has tended to supply a philosophic justification for whatever *seems to work*, whether it be true or not." (*Modern Religious Cults*, p. 61.)

Perhaps Mr. Dooley's summary of the teachings of this philosophy is more to the point than any of the more serious ones: "It's this way, Hennessy, whin the truth stops wurrkin', it's a lie, an' whin a lie starts goin' it's the truth." (See Articles on Pragmatism by Dr. Harris E. Kirk, *Union Sem. Review*, Vol. XXI, Nos. 1, 2, 3.)

The core principle of pragmatism seems perilously akin to the jesuitical maxim, "The end justifies the means." If followed to what Eucken calls "its ultimate bearings," the ideal would prove to be the Jonah and the practical would be the whale.

So far we have spoken of the ideal and the practical as they stand in mutual contrast or opposition. And they *are* in opposition when the practical is regarded as an end in itself, instead of the means to the higher ends of idealism. But when truth is put on its feet instead of being made to stand on its head, there is a close and proper correlation between the ideal and the practical.

It has been said that every man is at bottom either a Platonist or an Aristotelian—Plato standing for the philosophy of idealism and Aristotle for the philosophy of the practical. This is no doubt true, speaking by and large; but in this as in all other attempted classifications of mankind, according to temperament and turn of mind, there are intermediate grades between the two extremes. In every human being the ideal and the practical overlap to a greater or less extent.

The rounded character, the balanced personality, is the man in whom the ideal lifts the practical above the sordid, while the practical holds the ideal to solid fact and substantial truth. The ideal is the kite that catches the winds of heaven and rises by their force; the practical is the tail of the soaring kite that serves as ballast and saves it from the floundering that ends in wreck. Freedom without restraint always spells disaster.

Let a man by all means hitch his wagon to a star, but let him take warning from the philosopher who was so absorbed in gazing into the heavens that he stumbled into a well.

Sydney Smith in one of his letters speaks of a Scotch friend, of whom he says, "I never saw so theoretical a head which contained so much practical understanding," and then remarks, "What I object to in Scotch philosophers in general is, that they pursue truth without caring if it be useful truth. The philosophy that descends to the present state of things is debased in their estimation." His genial gibe at the Scotch philosopher is illustrated in the following letter: "Dear Lady Holland: I take the liberty to send you two brace of grouse—curious, because killed by a Scotch metaphysician; in other and better language, they are mere ideas, shot by other ideas, out of a pure intellectual notion called a gun." (*Memoirs of Rev. Sydney Smith,* Vol. II, pp. 15, 46.)

The ideal, strictly speaking, is vision as contrasted with sight. It endures as seeing the invisible. Like faith, it is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The ideal is the goal; the practical is the path that leads, it may be through a maze of difficulties, to that goal. Men have cherished ideals that are purely visionary—shadows and phantasmagoria that flit through the fool's paradise. Don Quixote is the outstanding example of pathetic idealism,—the idealism of a noble soul with astigmatic vision. "Don Quixote," says Vincente Blasco Ibanez, "is poor mortal man, who desires to make right and justice triumph, and who stumbles and falls in his noble efforts. At times the American people take Sancho Panza as their model and think only of material satisfactions, of the egoisms that make our life comfortable. On other occasions they display a generosity and idealism as lofty as that of Don Quixote." *(International Book Review,* Dec. 1923.) If we have to choose between the two, the noble but illusory idealism of the Don is infinitely better than the coarse and sordid materialism of his servant. It is far nobler to have visions, "trailing clouds of glory as they come," but destined "to die away, and fade into the light of common day," than to be possessed of a soul shut in by shades of the prison house, never lifting to let in "the light that never was on sea or land."

But we are not shut up to this alternative. The vision that we cherish may be "a phantom of delight," and at the same time "a creature not too bright or good for human nature's daily food." It may be like Wordsworth's skylark, that soars to sing at heaven's gate, but builds its nest on "the dewy ground;" "Ethereal minstrel, pilgrim of the sky, despising not the earth where cares abound." As *idealism* is of two distinct species, so the practical is of two diverse kinds. The ideal as we have observed is the goal, the practical is the path that leads to the goal. But the path may be *straight*, or it may be *crooked*. How different the impression made by the word "practical," as applied to a politician from that which it makes when applied to a statesman!

The phrase, "a practical politician," suggests unscrupulousness, a time-serving demagogue who seeks to attain his selfish ends, like Ah-Sin, the heathen Chinee, "by ways that are dark and tricks that are vain." But a "*practical statesman*" is suggestive of a *patriot*, who follows high ends for his country by ways that are *wisely* and *astutely chosen*, but never crooked or debased. There is "the practical" that sacrifices principle to policy, and there is "the practical" that strives towards the ideal by the best way that is open to it, at the time, compromising, it may be, with that which is below the level of the highest, but never with that which is wrong.

John Morley says of Gladstone: "Hard as he strove for a broad basis in general theory and high abstract principle, yet always aiming at practical ends, he kept in sight the *opportune*." He held that government is "a huge, rough machine, and those concerned in working it *have to be satisfied with what is far below the best.* It was very easy to label him as an *opportunist*, yet if an opportunist be defined as a statesman who declines to attempt to do a thing until he believes that it can really be done, what is that but to call him a man of common sense?" (*Life of Gladstone*, Vol. I, p. 190; Vol. II, p. 241; Vol. III, p. 539.) He was the brightest of those political lights that shed lustre on Queen Victoria's reign, of whom the poet-laureate wrote:

> *"And statesmen at her council met*
> *Who knew the seasons when to take*
> *Occasion by the hand, and make*
> *The bounds of freedom wider yet."*

Justin McCarthy says that even Gladstone's enemies felt that one idea always inspired him—*a conscientious anxiety to do the right thing*. None accused him of being one of the politicians, who, as Victor Hugo says, "mistake a weather-cock for a flag." (*History of Our Own Times*, Vol. I, p. 432.)

Our own Grover Cleveland was of the same moral type, but still more sturdy, holding to his ideal of public office as a public trust, in the face of the hostility and ridicule of the practical politicians, and shallow demagogues, with a tenacity that has hardly been equalled in all the history of statesmanship. But his ideals were not those of the visionary or the fanatic. In one of those sententious sayings for which he was famous, he created a maxim of practical statemanship that has taken its place among the political proverbs of the world: "It is a *condition* that confronts us—*not a theory*." (*Annual Message*, 1887.) He had wise regard to conditions, but as a high idealist, he could never consciously sacrifice principle on the altar of expediency. "The way of right and justice," said he, "should be followed as a matter of duty, and regardless of immediate success." (*Modern Eloquence*, Vol. I, p. 231.) Some one has aptly likened him to the pilot of whom old Seneca wrote, who when his boat was overtaken by a terrific storm that threatened to engulf it, said to Neptune: "O god of the sea, thou mayest save me if thou wilt; and if thou wilt, thou mayest destroy me; but, *whether or no, I will steer my rudder true*." (*Montaigne's Essays*, XVI; *Seneca Epist*. 85.)

The lines addressed by Tennyson to the Duke of Argyll when, at the sacrifice of his political fortunes, he stood firm for what he deemed to be a great principle, present an almost perfect picture of the balance between the ideal and the practical in statesmanship:

*"O Patriot Statesman, be thou wise to know*
*The limits of resistance, and the bounds*
*Determining concession; still be bold*
*Not only to slight praise, but suffer scorn;*
*And be thy heart a fortress to maintain*
*The day against the moment, and the year*
*Against the day; thy voice, a music heard*
*Thro' all the yells and counter-yells of feud*
*And faction, and thy will, a power to make*
*This ever-changing world of circumstance,*
*In changing chime with never-changing Law."*

The late Professor Richard G. Moulton in his Literary Introduction to Deuteronomy has called attention to "the strange clash between opposing tides of feeling" as the most impressive feature of the book. It has been called the most spiritual, the most idealistic, book in the Old Testament. It is marked by a solemn sense of the invisible God as always present, and of religion as an affair of the seeing heart "penetrating through the surface of duties to the spring of holy motives." On the other hand, "nowhere else in Scripture does the utilitarian side of religion appear so nakedly stated or so urgently pressed."

It does not stop with the general statement "that the God of providence is also the God of morals." It descends to details, to materialistic details, in pointing out the consequences of Israel's conduct.

In these great orations Moses almost catalogues the plagues and diseases that will follow disobedience, and he itemizes the rewards of obedience in terms of the basket and the kneading trough, of vines and fig trees, of the increase of herds and flocks.

What is the key to this paradox? It is the old story of the idealistic statesman, in this case an inspired statesman, dealing with a people without vision, a hand-to-mouth generation, smitten with a consuming hunger for today's bread, and valuing only what is immediately practical and visibly profitable. It is the tragedy that cast its dark shadow across the path of George Washington, and that broke the heart of Woodrow Wilson. (See *The Modern Readers' Bible*, One Volume Edition, p. 1370.)

I wish there were time to speak of the ideal and the practical in business, in labour and capital, in professional life, in journalism, in education and in legislation, each of which might call for a special lecture, or even a volume. But I shall pass by all of these except the last two, and shall touch these very lightly in the time that remains.

Ex-President Coolidge says: "Education must give not only power but direction. It must minister to the whole man or it falls. Such an education does not come from science. That provides power alone, but not direction." He then enters a plea for the study of the Greek and Roman Classics and of our own great literature, and adds, "The classic of all classics is the Bible." "I do not underrate," he says, "schools of science and technical arts. They have a high and noble calling in ministering to mankind. . . . I am pointing out that in my opinion they do not provide a civilisation that can stand without the support of the ideals that come from the classics."

These are wise words, and they find an illustration in the recent history of a great nation. In the latter half of the Nineteenth Century, the German universities began to crowd the classics to a back seat to make room for scientific and technical training. The great scholar and theologian, Dr. Dollinger, speaking in 1872 at the celebration of the 400th anniversary of the University of Munich, alluded to this in words that have proved to be sadly prophetic: "Who knows," said he, "but that for a time Germany may remain confined, without air and light, in that strait prison which we call Materialism? This would be the forerunner of national ruin." (*Modern Eloquence*, Vol. VIII, p. 527.)

One of our own idealists, Dr. William Ellery Channing, years ago sounded the warning for us:

"The ground of a man's culture lies in his nature, not in his calling. His powers are to be unfolded on account of their inherent dignity, not their outward direction. He is to be educated because he is man, not because he is to make shoes, nails or pins." (*Channing's Works*, p. 19.)

Dr. Charles A. Ellwood, Professor of Sociology in the University of Missouri, points out, after the same fashion, the eclipse, or partial eclipse, of cultural values by exalting the practical. "Judged from the standpoint of its leadership in culture, our educational system must be rated low. . . . For some years past the trend in our education has been materialistic. Science has been exalted, to be sure, but science has been confused with physical science; and even then what has been taught has been not so much the spirit of science as the results of science as a basis for vocational and economic success. Materialistic interests have so invaded our high schools and dominated our universities that even some of our more thoughtful business men have at times voiced a protest. The practical is emphasised until the higher cultural interests are almost lost sight of. Real scholarship under such circumstances, even in the universities, is often at a discount, and economic success is the thing uppermost in the minds of the most ambitious students. There is surely some ground for the criticism of our European friends that such education produces skill in techniques, but no true culture." (Charles A. Ellwood—*Man's Social Destiny*, p. 153.)

John Henry Newman has a beautiful paragraph on what he calls the *beau ideal* of an educated intellect: "It is almost prophetic from its knowledge of history; it is almost heart-searching from its knowledge of human nature; it has almost supernatural charity from its freedom from littleness and prejudice; it has almost the repose of faith, because nothing can startle it; it has almost the beauty and harmony of heavenly contemplation, so intimate is it with the eternal order of things and the music of the spheres." (*Modern Eloquence*, Vol. IX, p. 923.)

I fear that in America we have drifted too far from these high ideals in our eagerness for technical education. Professor George Santayana says, "The American is an idealist working on matter. Understanding as he does the material potentialities of things, he is successful in invention, and quick in emergencies. All his life he jumps into the train after it has started, and jumps off before it stops, and he never once gets left or breaks a leg. . . . To my mind the most striking expression of his materialism is his singular pre-occupation with *quantity*. If, for instance, you visit Niagara Falls, you may expect to hear how many cubic feet or metric tons of water are precipitated per second over the cataract"—and then he slyly adds: "This is what I confidently expected to hear on arriving at the adjoining town of Buffalo. But I was mistaken. The first thing I heard instead was that there are more miles of asphalt pavement in Buffalo than in any city in the world."

But he adds this optimistic note: "When the senses are sharp and joyous, as in the American, they are already liberated; and when the heart is warm, like his, and eager to be just, its ideal destiny is hardly doubtful. Time and its own pulses will give it wings." (*The Living Age*, March 8, 1919, pp. 589-595.)

As to the ideal and the practical in legislation, I wish to call attention to the wonderful adjustment and balance of the two in the laws of Moses, which have been too often overlooked.

The Hon. James M. Beck in his recent book on the Constitution of the United States says: "Too little attention has been paid by the legal profession to questions of moral psychology. . . . And yet, to paraphrase the saying of the Master, 'the laws were made for man and not man for the laws,' and if the science of law ignores the study of human nature and attempts to conform man to the laws rather than the laws to man, then its development is a very partial and imperfect one."

This remark of Mr. Beck's amounts to this, that it is a condition and not a theory that confronts the framers of law. Wise legislation will always take into account the stage of progress, and conditions of life reached by those for whom the laws are intended.

Now the legislation of Moses shows marvellous wisdom in this respect. The government of Israel was, according to Moses, a theocracy. Jehovah was not only the moral governor, but the civil ruler of the nation, the legislator and king. As moral governor He gave a perfect ideal of morality, which because it is perfect can never be added to or taken from. But as civil governor He enacted practical statutes adapted to the stage of progress reached by the people, and the condition under which they were to live. The perfect ideal is found in what we call the moral law, finding its expression negatively in the "shall nots" of the Ten Commandments, and positively in the summary of the two tables of the Decalogue in the comprehensive statement: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself." There stands the perfect ideal of religion and morality for all time!

But even a wise *human* government will not expect or attempt to realise an ideal of morality by statute law; much less will an All-wise God. People cannot be legislated into goodness, which is a thing of the heart. And we find in the Mosaic *statutes*, which constitute the civil as distinguished from the moral law, this great principle fully reccognised. The ideal standard is enacted once for all, in the moral law; but the statutes of the civil code, which is a very different thing, are thoroughly practical in being adapted to human nature and to the people of Israel in the conditions of that time. I wish I had time to illustrate this in detail. But two quotations from the New Testament will, I hope, make the matter sufficiently clear. "The Pharisees came to Jesus, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? And He answered and said unto them, what did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote this precept. But it was not so in the beginning, for from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife and they twain shall be one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Mark 10:2-9.) There we have the ideal, the indissolubility of the marriage bond as it was instituted by the Creator in the beginning; but in legislation the imperfections of human nature, "the hardness of men's hearts," had to be considered, and the statute law adapted to actual conditions. The hardness of men's hearts cannot be legislated out of them.

The other passage that I wish to quote is from the eighth chapter of Romans: "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, (that is, through the infirmities of human nature), God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in those who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." That is, law has its limitations, because it is dealing with human beings, with the weakness of the flesh, with the hardness of men's hearts,—confronting not a theory but a condition. If man is to be brought into conformity to a perfect ideal of morality, something beyond legislation is absolutely necessary; and that something is *a new spirit within him.* The love of that which is evil must be condemned—must be put to death on the altar of his heart, and the love of righteousness must be enshrined there; then, by an inner and voluntary impulse, he will "walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." "Except a man be born again"—changed in the spirit of his mind—"he cannot enter the Kingdom of God,"—he cannot be conformed in his life to the ideal and the laws of that Kingdom.

It has been argued, from the fact that some of the statutes of Moses seem to fall below what is ideally perfect, and are not adapted to the social and political conditions of today, that the Mosaic system did not come by Divine inspiration, as it claims to have come. On the contrary, the marvellous combination of the ideal and the practical in that system is one of the strongest arguments that can be advanced for its Divine origin. It is the very perfection of wisdom in legislation—which the world is far from having attained. Especially does America need to sit at the feet of Moses, that she may learn the limitations of legislation, and rely more and more on moral influences and the power of Christ and His gospel to lift the life of her people toward the perfect ideal: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all thy soul and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself." "Love," says the greatest of the Apostles, "is the fulfilling of the law." You cannot create love by legislation.

There is a story told of George V that, when he was a small boy, the prime minister was discussing with his father, Edward VII, some matter of restrictive legislation, when the little fellow broke into the discussion with the naïve and childish remark: "If I ever become king, I'm going to have a law passed *abolishing all sin*." He has been king for a score of years, but up to date the law abolishing all sin has not been forthcoming.

In this lecture I have tried to suggest some of the ideals that should characterise a nation and set it free from the bondage of sordid and so-called practical aims. But a nation cannot rise above the individuals that compose it. Each citizen contributes his quota to the national character, and men influence one another in unsuspected and subtle ways. All this enhances tremendously the power and importance of personal ideals—ideals high enough to

*"Set up a mark of everlasting light*
*Across the howling senses' ebb and flow."*

The Christian's ideal is found in the person of Jesus Christ, "drawn out in living characters." To be conformed to His image in his highest aspiration for himself and God's eternal purpose for him. Christ in him, the hope of glory, is the power of God transforming him into Christ's image from glory to glory, as by the Lord the Spirit.

Louis Pasteur wrote his own epitaph, which may be read by those who visit his mausoleum in the Institute that bears his name: "Happy is he who has a Deity within him, an ideal of beauty which he obeys, an ideal of art, an ideal of country, an ideal of the virtues of the Gospel." These ideals were wrought into his life and work, and made him a great world citizen and exalted him to a place among the immortals, who being dead yet speak, and whose names will be fragrant to the end of time.

No true idealist can ever realise his own ideal; for every ideal dies as an ideal in the moment of attainment. It is a flying goal, ever eluding the outstretched hand of the pursuer—"For a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?"

*"There on the border*
*Of boundless Ocean,*
*And all but in Heaven,*
*Hovers the Gleam.*
*Not of the sunlight,*
*Not of the moonlight,*
*Not of the starlight!*
*O young mariner,*
*Down to the haven,*
*Call your companions,*
*Launch your vessel*
*And crowd your canvas,*
*And, ere it vanishes*
*Over the margin,*
*After it, follow it,*
*Follow the Gleam."*

# VII

# "THE LAW OF LIBERTY" AND SELF-RESTRAINT

TWICE in the Epistle of James occurs the phrase that stands at the head of this lecture, "the law of liberty." (1:25; 2:12.) The words seem to present a paradox, a contradiction in terms, as if one should speak of a square circle or an octagonal hexagon. We do not ordinarily associate law with liberty. For law implies either constraint or restraint. Its purpose is to constrain us by external authority to follow certain lines of conduct, or to restrain us from certain other lines of conduct. We are constrained by law to pay taxes, to render military service in time of war, unless age or physical disability or some other disqualifying circumstance renders us exempt, and to perform many other civic duties.

And on the other hand we are restrained by law from destroying or injuring our neighbour's property, from the manufacture, sale, or purchase of intoxicating beverages, and from many other things subversive of the rights of our fellow-men or contrary to the public good.

The ideas that we associate with law, therefore, are the ideas of constraint and restraint. But James speaks of *a law of liberty*, which seems to imply that there is, or may be, such a thing as a law, which so far from declaring, "Thou shalt," or "Thou shalt not," bids a man do as he chooses.

Now is there really, or ideally, any such law as the law of liberty—a law that abolishes both constraint and restraint—the law of doing just as one pleases?

Let us see if we can find in human society anything that resembles, either ideally or in actual operation, a law of liberty.

1. There are the words "anarchy," "anarchism," and "anarchist," which suggest the thought of a lawless state of society, in which there is no constituted authority to exercise constraint or restraint. Every man does as he chooses, to the top of his bent. The only law is

> *"The good old rule, the simple plan,*
> *That they should take who have the power,*
> *And they should keep who can."*

Our minds at once revolt against any such conception.

But there are two kinds of social anarchism which should be carefully distinguished. First, there is what is called *communistic anarchism*. The anarchists of this school contend for the abolition by force and violence of all government and all law. They are dynamiters and bomb-throwers and assassins.

"This country had startling evidence of the strength and audacity of the anarchist leaders in a great meeting held in May 1886, in the Haymarket at Chicago, which seemed part of a concerted plan not only to preach but also to practice defiance of law, and which ended in the most serious conflict with the police an American city had ever witnessed." (Woodrow Wilson, *A History of the American People, Vol. V, p. 187.)* The assassinations, or attempted assassinations, of many European rulers within the last half-century, and the assassination of President McKinley in 1901, were natural fruits of communistic anarchism.

The aim of this school of anarchists is the abolition of private property, and as government and law are the guardians of private ownership, government and rulers must be destroyed and law abolished.

To this kind of anarchism we may say, as King Arthur said to his faithless queen,

*"The children born of thee are sword and fire,*
*Red ruin, and the breaking up of laws."*

If this is what is meant by a law of liberty, we want none of it.

*"License they mean, when they cry, Liberty!*
*For who loves that must first be wise and good."*

But there is another kind of anarchism, which has at its heart a certain noble ideal. It is called *philosophical anarchism.* It contemplates a state of society without the constraint, and with a minimum of the restraint, of law. It proposes to reach this ideal condition, it is true, by revolution. But whereas communistic anarchism advocates revolution by violence, philosophical anarchism hopes to attain its end through peaceful revolution brought about by the propagation of ideas. It preaches that men should not be compelled to pay taxes, to render military service, etc., but that what is done for the public welfare should be done voluntarily and without compulsion by law.

Now, there is in this, as I said, a certain noble ideal and worthy aspiration. It is a gesture toward the law of liberty. But the trouble is that it is only a gesture—purly theoretical, thoroughly Utopian, and utterly impracticable under human conditions as they now exist. It is but a shadow of the law of liberty.

2. But if we look about us we shall see that something like a law of liberty is operating within certain limits today.

There are, for instance, men in all our communities who do not need, in certain areas of conduct, either constraint or restraint by statute. For, as the Apostle Paul says, "law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly." (I Timothy 1:9.) The honest man doesn't need statutes against theft to keep him from stealing. The man who has no malice in his heart needs no law against murder. The man whose thoughts are pure will be pure in life without constraint of law to make him pure, or the restraint of law to keep him from violating the purity of others. The industrious, home-loving man needs no officer to arrest him for idleness and vagrancy. Such men are governed from within by their own free choice of that which is decent and right.

To come nearer home, each of us has at least a few intimate and trusty friends, for whom in our social relations we have no law except the law of liberty. We give them *carte blanche*. There are friends whom I would not hesitate to leave as guests in my home, during my absence, under the law of liberty; to whom I would say, "Make yourself perfectly at home. Do as you please. This for you is liberty hall." Why? Because I am sure they would not abuse their privileges. They would be more careful of my things than of their own. They would not bruise the furniture, nor break the dishes, nor soil the books.

The law of liberty is for those we trust. On them we lay no restrictions. Such signs as "No Trespassing" and "Keep Out" are wholly superfluous.

3. Another suggestion of the law of liberty is found in the new program of education. Even in the primary grades the three R's no longer reign supreme, but have stepped down from their throne to touch elbows with their fellow-citizens in a democratic alphabet of studies. And there was a time not so long ago when students had to follow a narrow, rigid, and uniform curriculum for graduation. There was practically only one route, for instance, to the bachelor's degree. A wider liberty came in with the broadening of the field of education and the introduction of the elective system. The modern university comes near taking the universe, "the totality of existing things," as its realm, and says to the student,

> *"No pent up Utica contracts your powers,*
> *But the whole boundless continent is yours."*

And not only has the field of education been enlarged, so that its scope is no longer insular but continental. The whole spirit of education has been liberalised. Teaching has been defined as "causing another to know." But the best teaching is more than this. De Quincey, in a famous passage, draws a distinction between what he calls the literature of knowledge and the literature of power. The literature of knowledge gives information, the literature of power imparts inspiration. And so it seems to me that teachers may be classified as teachers of knowledge and teachers of power. Teachers of knowledge instruct their pupils. Teachers of power not only instruct; they also inspire. Teaching should have in it an element of indoctrination, no doubt, but it should have a still larger element of inoculation, a contagion of the spirit of research and experimentation and open-mindedness to new truth. The conquests of the past are to be held as a base of operations, from which the future is to be invaded for fresh victories and wider acquisitions. A larger liberty is becoming more and more dominant in education. The textbook is no longer an oracle. It has become only an usher. It is no longer the main hall. It has become the vestibule to the *library*, and opens the gate to "fresh woods and pastures new"—and spacious.

Nor is it any longer the chief function of a teacher of science to conduct experiments in the presence of the class. He leads his students into the laboratory, where they are no longer onlookers at a respectful distance, but in-lookers at close quarters; no longer wonder-eyed spectators, but enthusiastic co-operators. And they are encouraged not to rest satisfied with repeating what they have seen done, but to strike out for themselves, to perform new experiments, and to do old things in new ways. Mistakes will be made, but experience through trial and mistake is in the long run the best teacher. Adventures in liberty are more alluring and ennobling than paths that are blocked by palisades. And the word laboratory has taken on a wider connotation. It is no longer restricted to the physical sciences, but the laboratory method is recognised and used in psychology, sociology, and the whole family of experimental "—ologies."

4. And what is true of education is true also of discipline. The old rigidities are gone in the school and in the home. In some instances the reaction toward laxity has undoubtedly gone too far. But the evils that have resulted have been due not to the rejection of the old rigidities, but to the failure to substitute something better.

"Our problem," says Professor Kilpatrick, "would seem to be to help our young people make the shift from external authority to internal authority. . . . Of course the danger is that the shift will be only *from* external authority and not *to* a basis of internal authority. In plainer words, the danger is that for a while at least no authority at all will obtain, that there will be an interval of moral chaos." (William Heard Kilpatrick, *Education for a Changing Civilisation*, p. 37.)

In passing from *authoritarianism*, the spirit of which is arbitrary and unreasoning, towards *authority*, which seeks to win obedience to itself, as far as possible, by appeal to reason and conscience, both authoritarianism and authority have too often been thrown over board, leaving the crew of youngsters without a captain to maintain order and direct the ship.

"A common wail among middle-aged folk, who are beginning to dwell in their memories," says Professor Luther A. Weigle, "is that 'children aren't made to *obey* any longer'. The measure of truth beneath this observation is that the ancient patriarchal type of parental authority is fast disappearing—where the father was an absolute monarch, and the children had to yield immediate and unquestioning obedience to the mere expression of his will:

*'Theirs not to reason why.'*

We have come to see that such discipline is not really education. And in most homes [it might be nearer the truth to say *many homes*] of today the attempt is made to exert an authority that is reasonable rather than arbitrary, that helps children to understand why parental commands are given, and leads them to obey the principles of the moral life *through* us who are their parents, rather than merely to bow their wills *to* us. It is true that the exercise of such reasonable authority is more difficult than simply to exact absolute and unthinking obedience to a rule of force. It demands of parents that they be reasonable. And it requires that they undertake to solve their problems instead of cutting their way through them Gordian-Knot-wise. It takes thinking, [and we might add, *self-control*] and thinking is always hard both to stop for and to do." (Luther Allan Weigle, *The Training of Children in the Christian Family*, pp. 29-30.)

The same thought has been well expressed by Patterson Dubois. " 'I will conquer that child, no matter what it may cost *him!*' boasts the misguided parent. But suppose the parent should say, 'I will help that child to conquer himself, no matter what it may cost *me.*'? Child first, and parent second, this is the root principle of discipline. In age, in strength, in experience, in judgment, in authority, of course, the parent is first—is the head. But this headship is simply a means to an end. The end is the child's growth in the discipline of his own individuality." (Patterson Dubois, *Beckonings from Little Hands.*)

"We should guard sacredly," says Dr. H. Clay Trumbull, "their privilege of personal choice; and while using every proper means to induce them to choose aright, we should *never, never, never* force their choice, even into the direction of our intelligent preference for them. The final responsibility of a choice and its consequences rests with the child, and not with the parent.

"A child's will ought to be strong for right-doing. If it be not so at the start, it is the parent's duty to guide, or train, it accordingly. But to break, or crush, a child's will, is inconsistent with the educating and training of that will. A conflict between a parent and a child, where the only question is, whose will shall yield to the other? is, after all, nothing more or less than a conflict of brute force. . . . All the way along through his training-life, a child ought to know what are to be the legitimate consequences of his chosen action, in every case, and then be privileged to choose accordingly. There is a place for punishment in a child's training, but punishment is a penalty attached to a choice; it is not brute force applied to compel action against choice." (H. Clay Trumbull, *Hints on Child-Training*, pp. 37-52.) Dr. Trumbull illustrates the difference between authoritarianism and authority in this way: a father says to his strong-willed child, "Johnny, shut the door." Johnny says, "I won't." What is the father to say and to do? If he is an advocate of authoritarianism, he would probably lose his temper and make the issue of brute force, "I will whip you until you shut that door!" and would proceed to carry out the threat.

The better way would be to handle the situation more in sorrow than in anger. "In most cases the very absence of any show of angry conflict on the father's part will prompt the child to choose to do that which he said he would not do. But if worst comes to worst (for we are here taking the extremest issue, which ought indeed rarely, if ever, to occur) let the parent say to the child: 'Johnny, I shall have to give you your choice in this matter. You can either shut that door or take a whipping.' Then a new choice is before the boy, and his will is free and unbroken for its meeting. Be it understood, the father has no right to say, 'I will whip you until you shut that door'; for that would be to deprive the boy of his will-power in the direction of his action: and that no parent is ever justified in doing. If the boy chooses to be whipped rather than to obey, the father must accept the result so far, and begin again for the next time; although, of course, there must be no undue severity in a child's punishment; even the civil law forbids that."

Sometimes it may be wise to let a child choose the penalty to be inflicted on him for wrong-doing. A case in point recently came under my own observation.

A quick-tempered child would now and then lose grip on himself, and, when over-wrought or fatigued, would resist his mother's will, even to the point of striking her in fits of anger. The father whipped him repeatedly for this, which seemed rather to aggravate than to mitigate the acuteness of the tantrums. At last, after one of these outbreaks, the mother had a quiet, serious talk with him, under which he melted and expressed sorrow and repentance. Instead of calling in the father to whip him, as she had done before, she asked if he didn't think he ought to be punished. He assented, and she put it up to him to decide what the penalty should be. Without suggestion from her, he proposed that he should be put to bed half an hour earlier every evening for a week, which she knew was for him no light thing. This punishment had at least two advantages: first, it was self-imposed, on the basis of his own sense of ill desert. It was the verdict and the sentence of

> *"The silent court of justice in his breast,*
> *Himself the judge and jury, and himself*
> *The prisoner at the bar."*

And second, its seven-fold recurrence recalled to the child's mind every evening for a week his serious offence, his mother's tender appeal, and his own protestation of sorrow and repentance for his wrong-doing. The self-imposed penalty seems to have effected what the infliction of punishment from without not only did not accomplish but only rendered worse.

A like approach to a law of liberty in the matter of discipline has been taking place in the school. As usual, we get a better view of the change by taking a considerable stretch of time. "Boston in 1845," says Professor Kilpatrick, "in an average public school of 400 pupils gave 65 whippings a day, one whipping every six minutes. In that same year hundreds of rural schools in Massachusetts had to be abandoned because the pupils drove their teachers away. Massachusetts stood then probably at the top in our country. From that day to this both whippings and school rebellions have, the country over, steadily declined. Instead of natural opposition between teacher and pupil, a different spirit is growing, of felt community of interest, with repression naturally occupying a smaller and smaller part. And what of pupil conduct? Go to the better high schools, for instance, and note how successfully a pupil committee manages the 'traffic' through the halls. You may not see any sign of management. Each pupil goes in quiet and orderly fashion to his next class. Ask the principal and he will tell you that lapses from proper discipline are few and almost always minor. Not that the millenium has been reached—no one claims it. Indeed certain outside ways of youth give deep concern, but discipline in the old school sense is largely a disappearing problem." (William Heard Kilpatrick, *Education in a Changing Civilisation,* pp. 90-91.)

Student self-government is taking the place, in a large degree, of government by the faculty. "The modern school tries to trust the child. With growing knowledge and skill it succeeds in trusting him more and more. When we think of the sixty-five whippings a day for four hundred children only seventy odd years ago, we rejoice in our progress. Education has gone forward. We have learned better how to trust. There is, however, yet room for growth. At present most schools are far behind the best. The best are often held back by senseless fears." *(Ibid,* p. 131.)

The same progress toward a law of liberty is seen in the general adoption of student self-government by our institutions of higher learning. When General Robert E. Lee became president of Washington College, (now Washington and Lee University,) he found there the prevailing system of discipline through a multiplicity of rules and regulations, which the faculty endeavoured to enforce by a policy of *espionage.* He at once supplanted it by *the honour system.*

"The effect on the minds of all, except the incurably vicious, was most salutary. It caused them to feel that they had a character to maintain, and inspired them with ambition to vindicate and strengthen the confidence which was reposed in them. Thus, from the beginning, it contributed greatly to the end which the president kept steadily in view in every disciplinary measure he framed or employed—to foster habits of self-control, of intelligent self-government, as the result, not of compulsion or penalties, but of reflection and choice." (Address on *Lee the College President* by the Rev. Dr. J. L. Kilpatrick, a member of Lee's Faculty. *Personal Reminiscences of General Robert E. Lee*, by J. William Jones, Chapter II.)

As a consequence, the honour-system has become well established at Washington and Lee University, and violations of it are very rare indeed. When such violations occur they are dealt with not by the faculty but by the organised student body. The result in each case is the dismissal of the offending individual from the institution. Examination papers and written quizzes always close with a written statement, upon the honour of the student, that no aid has been given or received. It is quite the custom for the professors to go out at pleasure, leaving the students alone in the examination rooms, and permission is given students on request, to do the same. The "honour system," which is a synonym for the law of liberty, has never reached a higher level than at Washington and Lee.

"There has grown up on the campus," says President Henry Louis Smith, "a method of buying and selling which must be unique, since it seems to awaken such amazement among visitors. The 'Co-op' store in the Washington Building has a regular counter piled with priced articles, where every customer pockets whatever articles he selects, makes his own change out of an open money-box, and departs without the intervention or even the notice of a salesman." Open barrels of tempting red apples and boxes of bagged peanuts, as well as hundreds of lapel buttons and other college emblems, have been bought and sold without a salesman present or in sight.

The secret of it all is disclosed in the concluding lines of Mrs. Margaret J. Preston's poem read at the University's Centennial Celebration:

> *"Ye will not walk ignoble ways:*
> *Ye dare not seek unworthy aims:*
> *Ye cannot do a deed that shames*
> *These heroes of our holiest days!*
> *Your oath a Roman oath must be,*
> *Sworn with a faith that will not yield—*
> *Sworn on the doubly sacred shield*
> *Of* Washington *and* Lee!"

Does the language of James, and do these examples of conduct which I have cited, imply or suggest abrogation of law and absence of restraint? If law is outlawed, why does James retain the word and weave it into the texture of his thought along with liberty—"the law of liberty"? He puts them together because they belong together. And he completes his thought by prefixing the word "perfect"—"the *perfect* law of liberty." Law is not perfect if it destroys liberty. It is only

> *"Blind Authority beating with his staff*
> *The child that might have led him."*

And liberty without law is license, which may be likened to a mother who by the promise of liberty first allures her children into bondage, and then devours them.

The perfection of which James speaks and which he stands off, as it were, to admire, lies in the blending of liberty and law. And he declares that the man whose gaze is caught and held by this perfect harmony of liberty and law can be no longer "a hearer that forgetteth," but becomes "a doer that worketh," and finds his blessedness, his liberty and delight, in doing what the law commands. The joyous cry of that man's heart is, "Mine ears hast thou opened: then said I, Lo, I am come; in the roll of the book it is prescribed to me: I delight to do thy will, O my God: Yea, thy law is within my heart." (Ps. 40:7-8.) Or as Moffatt renders it: "I answered, Here I come to do thy bidding in the Book; to please thee is my joy, thy law lies deep within my heart."

It is the freedom wherewith Christ our Lord has made us free which James has in mind when he speaks of "the law of liberty"—a law which is "at once an impulse and an obligation." It elicits obedience that is "both binding and spontaneous." Because of this blending of obligation and the soul's voluntary response thereto, it is called the perfect law.

Again, it is a perfect law because it is *automatic.* It requires no machinery and no official supervision nor external authority to enforce its mandates. It attains its ends not by outward compulsion but by inward volition. As Dr. Alexander Maclaren says, it is the law of which the Psalmist of old had caught a glimpse, when he declared that "the law of the Lord is perfect," because it "converts the soul." It changes the whole current of thought and desire and purpose, and does it at the fountain-head. It "converts *the soul.*" It wins its way by invincible persuasion into the heart, out of which are "the issues of life," and by it God's good Spirit turns the streams of speech and conduct whithersoever He will, as the streams of water are turned into the channels opened by the gardener, flowing freely therein at its own sweet will, and yet obeying the gardener's will, and bearing blessing in its hands to every tree and plant and vine according to his gracious purpose.

Again, it is called the *perfect* law of liberty because it is law in its maturity and therefore adapted to those who have likewise reached their maturity. The word here rendered "perfect" is the Greek word τέλειος, which in the New Testament usually means "of full age," "full-grown," "mature." (See Trench—*Synonyms of the New Testament.* XXII.) The old dispensation represented an immature stage of the law, the letter of the law, expressed in rules and formal statutes, suited to the immature. The new dispensation represents law in its full development, the spirit of the law, expressed in principles, suited to those who have passed out of childhood into maturity. The law of bondage has become a law of liberty, corresponding to the freedom of those who under the new dispensation have passed from under the hand of tutors and governors into the self-determination of full-grown sons. (Gal. 4:1-7.)

Again, the law of liberty is a *perfect* law, because it is instinct with life and power. It is "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" with power to make us "free from the law of sin and death." The Apostle, speaking of the old dispensation, says, "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness had been by the law." But "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." The old law could not give life, and without life there is no power to will and to do. In the gospel we have a new law which gives both.

"Liberty," says Dr. Maclaren, "is not exemption from commandment, but harmony with commandment. Whoever finds that what is his duty is his delight is enfranchised. We are at liberty when we walk within the limits of the gospel; and they who delight to do the law are free in obedience; free from the tyranny of their own lust, passions, and inclinations; free from domination of men and opinion and common customs and personal habits." (Alexander Maclaren, *Exposition of Holy Scripture*, James 1:25.)

*"Run thou and work, the law demands;*
*It gives me neither feet nor hands.*
*A better word the gospel brings,*
*It bids me fly, and gives me wings."*

The law of liberty does not involve freedom from restraint. But it shifts the source of restraint, so that it is no longer applied forcibly from without, but flows freely from within. Theodoret, in his *History of the Church*, records that when Melitius, Bishop of Antioch, saw Simeon of Stylites upon his pillar with his leg bound thereto with a chain of iron, he sent for a smith and had him break the chain. "For," said he, "to a man that loves God, his mind is a sufficient chain." The man who loves God with all his heart, his mind, and soul, and strength, and who loves his neighbour as himself.

needs no restraint except spontaneous self-restraint. His mind is a sufficient chain. "If a man love me," says Christ, "he will keep my word." (John 14:23.) "This is the love of God," says the Apostle of love, "that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous." They are not grievous to the loving heart. And as love sets us free in our relations to God, it also sets us free in our relations to our fellow-men. "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: love therefore is the fulfilment of the law." (Romans 13:10.)

Love is the secret and the safe-guard of liberty. James, accordingly, identifies the law of liberty with the law of love. "If," says he, "ye fulfil the royal law, according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well [or, it might be rendered, *ye are behaving beautifully*]. . . . So speak ye, and so do, as men that are to be judged by a law of liberty." (James 2:8, 12.) The law of liberty is a perfect law because it is the law of love, and "love never faileth." Its silken cords are stronger than iron chains.

"Some years ago," says Dr. Neal L. Anderson, "a Sunday School teacher wished to explain the great paradox to her class. She called up two little girls and, taking a strong cord, bound the hands of one of them together, tying the knots tight. She then told the other child to put her hands together and, binding them with a slight, golden thread, she said to her: 'Mary, if you love me, you will not break that thread.'

"Turning to the first child, whose hands were bound by the strong heavy twine she said: 'Free your hands.' The girl struggled, until the cords cut into her wrist, and finally, giving up, said she could not do it.

"Then, turning to the other, the teacher said: 'Mary, free your hands.' Mary stood without moving a muscle. The teacher repeated her command. Still she stood motionless, making no effort to break the tiny thread of gold. When the teacher asked her why she did not try to get loose, she answered: 'Teacher, you just told me if I loved you, I would not break this thread; and, teacher, I do love you.' " (Neal L. Anderson, *God's World and Word*, p. 130.)

It was not the thread that held her hands together, it was the constraining power of love. "The love of Christ constraineth us." He draws us and holds us "with cords of a man, with bands of love." (Hosea 11:4.) The law of liberty is the perfect law, the *only* perfect law, because it is the royal law of love.

Like every good thing the law of liberty is liable to various abuses. Against these there are repeated warnings. Peter reminds those to whom he writes that the law of liberty under which they live does not absolve them from the obligation of obedience to the law of the State. Therefore, says he, "submit to all human authority for the Master's sake; to the emperor, as supreme, and to the governors, as sent by Him to punish evil-doers, and to encourage those who do right. For it is the will of God that by doing right you should silence the ignorant charges of foolish people. Live like free men, only do not make your freedom an excuse for doing wrong." (I Peter 2:13-17 Goodspeed's

*New Testament.*) In this passage "doing right" refers to due submission to the laws of the state, and "doing wrong" to the disregard of those laws under the pretext of Christian freedom.

Another peril is the temptation to assert a selfish individualism under cover of the law of liberty. Against this the Apostle Paul, in the fifth chapter of Galatians, which is the charter of Christian freedom, utters an earnest warning. "Ye, brethren, were called for freedom: only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh [among the works of which he catalogues enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, envyings, etc.] But through love be servants one to another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another [by enmity, strife and jealousy,] take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." (Galatians 5:13-15.) As the law of liberty is not to be abused by disregard of the law of the state, neither is it to be set in opposition to the law of love, which calls for courtesy, kindness, self-control and consideration in the ordinary social relations of life, especially within the circle of the Christian brotherhood.

Again, he warns us against using the larger liberty, which is the fruit of larger knowledge and clearer intelligence, to the injury of our Christian brother who may be inferior in knowledge and intelligence and breadth of view. The particular matter from which he deduces the general principle is the eating of food that has been offered in the worship of idols in the heathen temples.

"We know," says he, "that no idol is anything in the world, and that there is no God but one." And we know, furthermore, that "food will not commend us to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse, nor, if we eat, are we the better. But take heed lest this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to the weak," lest "through thy knowledge he that is weak perisheth, the brother for whose sake Christ died. And thus sinning against the brethren and wounding their conscience when it is weak, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat causeth my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I cause not my brother to stumble." (I Cor. 8:1-13.)

Paul, the Apostle of liberty, laid down for himself several principles of restraint in the use of his freedom: 1. "All things (i. e., all things that are morally indifferent) are lawful; but not all things edify. Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbour's goods." (I Cor. 10:23-24.) There are things which are lawful for me, but they do not help my brother to build his life. On the contrary, in doing the thing that is not wrong in itself, I may be pulling down my neighbour's spiritual house.

2. "All things are lawful, but not all things are expedient." (I Cor. 10:23.) "Expedient"—*ex pede*—leaving the feet free, so as not to be *impeded* in the Christian race mentioned in the preceding chapter. "Know ye not that they that run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? Even so run, that ye may attain." (I Cor. 9:24.) The Greek word, happily rendered "expedient," is συμφέρειν, which means to "carry-with." The idea is that contained in our expression, "carry

on." "All things are lawful; but not all things help us *to carry on.*" It is the same thought that we find in Hebrews 12:1: "Let us throw off every impediment and the entanglement of sin, and run with determination the race for which we are entered." (Goodspeed's *New Testament*, An American Translation.)

3. Paul declared, "All things are lawful for me; but I will not be brought under the power of any." (I Cor. 6:12.) Things might be allowable, but he would see that they did not lord it over him. No reckless speeding for him. He would keep his brakes in good working order. He never allowed *things* to get into the saddle. That was *his* place. Under the law of liberty there was a world of things that were his. But he made up his mind to "use the world, as not using it to the full." (I Cor. 7:31.)

To him the Christian was a spiritual athlete striving in the games. In order to win, he must exercise self-control in all things. To this end he must buffet his body and bring it into bondage to his will. All this by way of discipline, that he might be in the pink of condition to meet Sin, his real adversary, in the ring. (I Cor. 9:25-27.)

4. Paul would do nothing, in itself lawful and desirable, that might diminish in the least his power and influence in his chosen calling. "I do all things," said he, "for the gospel's sake." And he also denied himself many things for the gospel's sake.

To the Corinthians he wrote concerning his policy of self-support, working with his own hands, and putting aside his right to be supported by those to whom he preached: "If we sowed unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things? If others partake of this right over you, do not we yet more? Nevertheless we did not use this right: but we bear all things, that we may cause no hindrance to the gospel of Christ." (I Cor. 9:1-18.)

There was another matter of self-restraint, of which, it has always seemed to me, he spoke with plaintive wistfulness. Paul had a great heart of love which would have found joy and rest in home life, pouring out its wealth of affection on wife and children. "Am I not free? Am I not an Apostle?" cries he, "have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" (I Cor. 9:1-5.) It would indeed have been *leading about* a wife, for he was an itinerating and peripatetic missionary, never tarrying very long in one place. But here too, the freedom that he claimed must yield to self-restraint, that the gospel of Christ might not be hindered by the demands of family life.

Finally, the law of liberty is a law that carries in itself its own recompense of rewards and penalties. "So speak ye, and so do," says James, "as men that are to be judged by a law of liberty." (James 2:12.)

Which of us could stand the test of perfect liberty today? What we call self-restraint does not always have its origin within. It does not represent our free choices of conduct and of speech. We are held in leash by public opinion, by fear of penalty or retaliation. We are often restrained from doing what we would like to do by selfish consideration rather than by preference for that which is right just because it is right.

The law of liberty, by which in the end we are all to be judged, is as inevitable in its results as a law of nature. When all external pressure and restraint shall be removed, each soul will rise or fall to its own level as certainly as water does. Each will go to his own place, as did Stephen the martyr on the one hand, and Judas the betrayer of his Lord on the other. (See Phillips Brooks'—*The Candle of the Lord*—Sermon XI.)

"Be not deceived," says Paul, "for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life. And let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. So then, as we have opportunity let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of the faith." (Galatians 6:7-10.) Let us "so speak, and so do, as men that are to be judged a law of liberty," as men who have been "delivered out of the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God." (Romans 8:20.)

*"Make me a captive, Lord,*
*And then I shall be free;*
*Force me to render up my sword*
*And I shall conqueror be.*

*"My heart is weak and poor*
*Until it master find:*

*It has no spring of action sure—*
*It varies with the wind:*

*"It cannot freely move*
*Till Thou hast wrought its chain;*
*Enclose it with Thy matchless love,*
*And deathless it shall reign."*

# VIII

## WHOSE MAN?

A MAN'S character and his worth to the world depend on his allegiances. Where does his loyalty lodge? Who are the leaders to whom he looks? Who are those to whom he gives his devotion and his service? Whose man is he?

"Know ye not," says the Apostle, "that to whom ye present yourselves as servants, his servant ye are to whom ye obey?" (Romans 6:16.)

Thus far in these lectures I have treated Freedom and Restraint in rather an impersonal way. By way of application I bring you now a personal question. What voluntary restraints do you place upon your freedom? To whom do you freely present yourself as a servant to obey? Whose man are you? Whose man ought you to be? To these questions I suggest a three-fold answer.

I. *You ought to be Nobody's Man.*

Alexander Pope was asked to compose an inscription for the collar of a dog belonging to the Prince of Wales, who was living in the palace at Kew. In response, he wrote this couplet:

*"I am his Highness' dog at Kew,*
*Pray tell me, Sir, whose dog are you?"*

Unless you are willing to lead a dog's life you'll wear no collar but your own. Douglas Jerrold was once asked to sit for his portrait to Landseer, the celebrated animal painter. With the quick wit, for which he was famous, Jerrold replied, in the words of Hazael to Elisha the prophet, "What! Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?" (II Kings 8:12-13.) So let "Nobody's Man" answer when it is proposed that he should wear a master's collar: "Am I a dog, that I should do this thing?"

"For freedom did Christ set us free; stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage." (Galatians 5:1.) You should wear no man's yoke.

That you may be nobody's man, several things are necessary:

1. You must be *dependent on nobody.* Let us cultivate a manly independence. We should pay our own way. We should be economically independent and self-supporting. Of course, I do not refer to those who have been rendered helpless by old age or disease, or who in the providence of God have been thrown on the care of others. But no man should be a lusty and lazy parasite, living on the labour of others.

Paul declared that he had not eaten bread for nought at any man's hand, but had worked night and day, in labour and travail, that he might not be a burden to any. Not that he, as one who laboured in the gospel, hadn't a right to live by the gospel; but he was foregoing his rightful remuneration, as an example and rebuke to those who were eating the bread of idleness, and living at the expense of others. He put this restraint on his freedom that he might drive home the charge he had given, "If a man will not work, he shall not eat." (II Thess. 3:8-10.)

To be nobody's man, one must *keep out of debt.* Remember that "the borrower is servant to the lender," the debtor to his creditor. "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." (Romans 13:8.) The spirit of Longfellow's Village Blacksmith is the spirit of a happy freeman:

*"His face is wet with honest sweat,*
*He earns whate'er he can;*
*He looks the whole world in the face,*
*For he owes not any man."*

2. To be nobody's man, *one must not allow himself to be subsidised.* A *subsidy* means, literally, some fee or favour bestowed to make one *subside,* to act as a sedative, to induce silence and inaction when the occasion demands plain speaking and hard knocks. Its purpose is to make God's watchmen blind, to cause His prophets to become as "dumb dogs that cannot bark." (Is. 56:10.) There is such a thing as a subsidised press, and a subsidised pulpit, and a subsidised court. Gifts prompted by friendship and affection may be accepted with grace and gratitude. But let a man beware of favours that might blindfold him from seeing what he ought to see, or muzzle him in what he ought to say, or tie his hands when he ought to strike. The law of Moses forbade the receiving of gifts by judges and other public officers, on the ground that they are in the nature of subsidies or bribes, and "a bribe doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous." (Deut. 16:19.)

"Bad men," says Solomon, "accept a secret bribe, to twist the course of justice." (Prov. 17:23—Moffatt's *Old Testament.)* A well-known judge was recently disbarred from the practice of law by the Supreme Court of his state for accepting money for legal services while he was on the bench. He entered the plea that the money was a gift, bestowed in appreciation of his services as a private mediator and arbitrator, and entirely disassociated from his work as a judge. The Court held, however, that "unless one has the moral strength of character to stand immovable in his fidelity to duty against the allurements of money, and to resist temptation to do those things that are prohibited by law and to the judge, then he no longer possesses that indispensable moral character which the good of society and the administration of justice demand of an attorney and counsellor at law." (As reported in *The Asheville Citizen,* Dec. 10, 1929.) The scandal of Tea-Pot Dome teaches the same lesson. "Every American citizen," says Professor Sumner, "is a sovereign, and sovereigns do not take tips."

A United States Senator cynically defined an honest politician as "one that will stay bought long enough to cast his vote in the interests of those who bought him." On the other hand, take the following public tribute paid to a Senator by one who had watched his career: "You cannot make him wear any collar except his own, and you cannot make him hide under any umbrella in any downpour of alleged popular demand. He is the tool neither of money nor of the mob. He worships neither the counting house nor the counting of heads in polling-booths. Defeat would be nothing to him in comparison with neglect of duty. . . . He fears the wrath of God a whole lot more than he fears the wrath of the people. . . . You cannot much scare a man in this world whose ultimate values are in another. (Wm. Hard, *Review of Reviews*, April 1928.)

God give us more such men;—

*"Men whom the lust of office does not kill;*
*Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;*
*Men who possess opinions and a will;*
*Men who love honour—and who will not lie;*
*Men who can stand before a demagogue,*
*And scorn his treacherous flatteries without winking;*
*Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog*
*In public duty and in private thinking."*

3. To be nobody's man, you *must fear nobody.* "The fear of man bringeth a snare." (Prov. 29:25.) Into that snare Herod fell, when, through fear of "them that sat at meat with him," he betrayed John the Baptist into the hands of the hateful Herodias and her cruel daughter. And in the same snare Pilate was entrapped, when wishing to release Jesus, but fearing the voice of the multitude, he delivered Him into their hands to be crucified.

The spirit of fear is the spirit of bondage. In the days of religious persecution, Palissy, the famous potter, was thrown into the Bastille because he had embraced the faith of the Huguenots. The King, Henry III, visited him in his prison and said to him, "I pity you, my worthy friend, but I am compelled, in spite of myself, to imprison you. Constrained as I am by the Guises and my own people, I cannot prevent them from putting you to death unless you will consent to abjure the faith you have adopted, and return to Mother Church." "Sire," replied the aged potter, "you say you pity me; it is for me to pity you, since you have said, '*I am compelled*.' It was not spoken like a king, sire; and those words, '*I am compelled*,' are words which neither you, nor the Guises, nor the people, shall ever make me utter. I am ready to give up my life for the honour of God. I can die!" "He who can die," said Seneca, "need never be constrained."

If we are to be free from the fear of man, *we must keep our record clean and our conscience clear*. The man who is trying to cover up some evil deed of the past is a slave to his fears. He is bondman to all who might bring to light his guilty secret. If our record is not clear it can be made so by repentance, confession and reparation. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but he that confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy"—both from God and from man. Paul was his own man, unawed by fear when he appeared before that august Court, the Sanhedrin, because he was able to say, "Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day." (Acts 23:1.) And that he might always be nobody's man, he declared, "Herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men." (Acts 24:16.) "For our rejoicing is this," said he, "the testimony of a good conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity we have behaved ourselves in the world." (II Cor. 1:12.)

The voice of an accusing conscience is

> *"As dreadful as the shout of one who sees*
> *To one who sins, and deems himself alone,*
> *And all the world asleep."*

"Thus conscience does make cowards of us all."

4. To be nobody's man is *to follow no man blindly*. Christ warns against this when he says: "You are not to be called 'rabbi,' for One is your teacher, and you are all brothers; you are not to call anyone 'father' on earth, for One is your heavenly Father; nor must you be called 'leaders,' for One is your leader, even Christ." (Matt. 23:8-10. Moffatt's *New Testament*.)

I have in my home town a friend who is a Jewish rabbi, and another who is a Catholic priest. I call one of them "Rabbi" and the other "Father," and both of them call me "Doctor," which of course means teacher. Are we violating the command of Christ in doing so? I think not. The admonition is not to be taken literally, but it is to be interpreted in the spirit of it, which is that we are neither to expect others to follow us, nor are we to follows others, *blindly*. We have our teachers and parents and leaders, whom God bids us to honour and revere. But there is only One Father with supreme authority; there is only One Teacher whose words are infallible; there is only One Leader whom we are all to follow without question. Our obedience to others is to be obedience "in the Lord." (Eph. 6:1; Col. 3:18.) We are to follow them only as they follow Christ.

Paul says in his great Epistle of liberty, that he submitted the gospel that he was preaching to

James and Cephas and John, who were accounted authorities in the Church, for their criticism and advice. But claiming that he had received his Apostleship not from men neither through man, he claimed that he was not dependent on men for his message. As he had been intrusted with the gospel for the Gentiles, even as Peter with the gospel for the Jews, he refused to circumcise Titus, who was a Gentile, though the Judaizers demanded it: "to whom," says he, "we gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for one hour."

And, moreover, when Peter ate with Gentiles at Antioch, but afterwards, when certain followers of James came down from Jerusalem, drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision, Paul resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned as guilty of cowardice and inconsistency. He certainly did not regard Peter as pope, endowed with infallibility, nor did he follow James and John as men who could not err. (Galatians, Chapters 1 and 2.)

If you are to be nobody's man, *you must learn to make your own decisions where the final responsibility rests with you.* Of course where responsibility is shared with others, you must yield to the judgment of the majority, after expressing views at which you have endeavoured to arrive by independent thinking.

Being in years "such an one as Paul the aged," I am old enough to have had some experience, and to have learned some lessons, perhaps, that are worth passing on to younger men. I have made many mistakes when following my own judgment. But I have made more mistakes, and more serious mistakes, when I have blindly followed others. I have often sought advice and profited by the counsel of others. But when I have accepted and acted upon the conclusions of others, which after careful thought and earnest prayer did not commend themselves to my own judgment, I have almost invariably gone wrong. Seek wise counsellors and keep your mind open to suggestions, but in matters that properly hang on your own decision, pass suggestions from others through the crucible of your own judgment and conscience, and frame and follow your own decisions accordingly. I say through your own *judgment and conscience*, mind you, not through your *prejudices and pride of opinion*, against which we must all be on guard. "The *meek* will He guide in judgment; the *meek* will He teach His way." Paul says that when he heard God's call to preach Christ among the Gentiles, straightway he conferred not with flesh and blood. (Galatians 1:15-17.) "Neither went I up to Jerusalem," he adds, "to them that were Apostles before me." One clear call was enough for him, and he did not care to muffle the heavenly call by opening his ear to human voices.

It was only after three years that he went up to Jerusalem to lay before the chief apostles the gospel he had been preaching among the Gentiles. And even then and there, as we have seen, after hearing what others had to say, he made his own decisions in matters of personal responsibility. Not for one hour did he yield to the demands of those who came in privily to spy out his liberty in Christ Jesus, and to bring him into bondage to their traditional views. Paul was ready on occasion to confer with others, but he was as far as possible from being what is called in political circles a "Yes-man." He knew how to say "No" even to his true yoke-fellow, Barnabas. (Acts 15:36-41.)

II. Whose man ought you to be? My second answer to the question is, *you ought to be everybody's man.*

"Though I was free from all men," says Paul, "I brought myself under bondage to all." Though he was nobody's man, he made himself everybody's man. So it should be with us all.

1. *You should be everybody's man in sympathy*. Our sympathies should be as wide as the human race to which we belong, and as deep as the human heart which we share.

"I am a man," wrote the Latin poet, Terence, "I count nothing that concerns man a matter of unconcern to me." (*Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*.)

> *"Never elated while one man's oppress'd;*
> *Never dejected while another's blessed,"*

was Alexander Pope's way of saying, "Rejoice with those that rejoice, and weep with those that weep."

Doubtless we cannot follow the late Eugene Debs in his Socialistic views, and we may not approve of his inflammatory speeches during the World War denouncing conscription. But we can hardly withhold our admiration from the sentiments he uttered in addressing the jury that convicted him. "Gentlemen," said he, "I have been accused of obstructing the War. I admit it, gentlemen; I abhor war. I would oppose the War if

I stood alone. Years ago I recognised my kinship with all living beings, and I made up my mind that I was not one bit better than the meanest of the earth. I said then, and I say now, that while there is a lower class, I am in it; while there is a criminal element, I am of it; while there is a soul in prison, I am not free." His head no doubt was often wrong in its thinking. But who will say that his heart was not right in the depth and breadth of its sympathies? Our ears should be open to catch "the still sad music of humanity." "Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; them that are ill-treated, as being yourselves also in the body," wrote the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (Heb. 13:3.)

"Who is weak, without my being weak?" writes Paul to the Corinthians, "whose conscience is hurt without my being fired with indignation?" (II Cor. 11:29. Goodspeed's *New Testament.*) To him who has "put on the new man, after the image of him that created him," declares he, "there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all, and in all." (Col. 3:11.)

"You called me brother," said a negro porter on whose arm leaned a sick man, as he left the Pullman car to enter the hospital where a little later he died. "You called me brother, and you asked after my wife and children. I couldn't take money from *you.*" The man whose tip was refused was Frank Higgins, Sky Pilot to the lumberjacks of Minnesota.

Nor was this expression of brotherhood exceptional with the Sky Pilot. Years before this, while trudging through the forest in the dead of winter, he had stumbled on a lumberjack who had fallen dead-drunk in the snow. But for his rescue by Higgins, he would have frozen to death. On his visit to the Camp the next summer, Higgins found the same man drunk again, lying in his own vomit and smeared with filth. He dragged him to the nearby river, and gave him and his clothes a cleansing bath. Sobered by the cold water, and waiting for his clothes to dry, the man Louis did some thinking.

"Mr. Higgins," he said, "you're white pine without a knot. I'm a low-down dirty bum, and yet you're white to me. You treat me like a brother."

"That's our relation, Louis," said the Sky Pilot. "We *are* brothers." "Brothers for whose sake Christ died," says Harold B. Hunting,—"Such, to Frank Higgins, were all his fellow-men." (Harold B. Hunting, *Pioneers of Goodwill*, pp. 93-94.) He was one who could say, as we all should say, with Tennyson:

*"Slav, Teuton, Kelt, I count them all*
*My friends and brother souls,*
*With all the peoples, great and small,*
*That wheel between the poles."*

2. You should be everybody's man *in service.* To offer words of sympathy without readiness to serve is but

*"To keep the word of promise to the ear,*
*And break it to the hope."*

"If a brother or sister be naked and in lack of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled; and yet ye give them not the things needful for the body; what doth it profit?" (James 2:15-16.) Sympathy, if it have not the spirit of service, is dead in itself, even as the body apart from the spirit is dead. Or, as an old friend of mine used to put it, in his quaint, terse way, "It is not worthwhile to *feel*, unless you *feel in your pocket*."

No doubt the priest and the levite, in the parable, whispered, "Poor fellow!" as they glimpsed the man who had fallen among robbers, lying naked, wounded, and half-dead by the road-side, but nevertheless they passed by on the other side. Their sympathy hadn't force enough to translate itself into action. It was left to a stranger, of a hated race and an abhorred religion, to show what it is to be everybody's man in tender and unselfish service. The parable was spoken in answer to the question, Who is my neighbour? And it was asked by one, wishing to justify himself, set as narrow limits as possible to the meaning of the word, neighbour. He was trying, as we say, to do as little as he could get by with, and for purposes of self-complacency. But Christ's answer teaches plainly that thoughts of self-complacency are out of place in the love that serves. The man who truly loves his neighbour does not serve that neighbour in order to pat himself on the back, but in order to be helpful to another's need. Nor does he seek to fix frontiers to his love by asking, "And who is my neighbour?" But, in the severest test that race prejudice and social caste and religious bigotry can bring to bear, he proves himself neighbour to the man on the outermost circle, removed from him by the whole diameter of human life.

Love makes him everybody's man without stop or stint. And he serves his fellow-man without self-consciousness or self-parade. He belongs to the company of those who "do good by stealth, and blush to find it fame." His quiet helpfulness is of the same sort as . . .

*"—That best portion of a good man's life,*
*His little, nameless, unremembered acts of kindness and of love."*

"Then shall the righteous answer, saying, Lord, when saw we Thee hungry, and fed Thee? or thirsty, and gave Thee drink? And when saw we Thee a stranger, and took Thee in? or naked, and clothed Thee? And when saw we Thee sick, or in prison, and came unto Thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me." (Matt. 25:37-40.) "Everybody's man" looks for *the least* and delights to be the bond-servant of *the lowliest* for Christ's sake. The true neighbour of mankind is no respecter of persons. He is ready to serve the prince in his palace or the peasant in his cottage. Man's need is his opportunity, without regard to the title or rank of the man whose need strikes for him the hour of service.

"To the Jews," cries Paul, "I became as a Jew; to them that are under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, not being without law to God, but under law of Christ, that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak: I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some." (I Cor. 9:20-22.)

Paul was nobody's man when it came to compromise in a matter of principle, but he was everybody's man when it came to concession in a matter of convenience or of convention for another's good, and especially his eternal good. "As we have opportunity," wrote he, "let us work that which is good toward all men." (Gal. 6:10.) Let us be everybody's man.

III. Whose man ought you to be? My third answer to the question is, *You ought to be God's man.*

Paul loved to call himself "the bond-servant of God." (Titus 1:1.) He was by a glorious paradox God's freedman and God's slave. Set at liberty by God's grace, he rejoiced in the love that would not let him go. "Thanks be unto God," he cried, "who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ." He was glad to be chained to the chariot of the conquering Christ, as a trophy of the grace of his Lord, who had despoiled the principalities and the powers of Satan's kingdom, making a show of them openly, and triumphing over them through the power of His Cross. (II Cor. 2:14; Col. 2:15.) But the chain that bound him was the chain of love. "The love of Christ constraineth us," said he, "because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all, that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again." (II Cor. 5:14-15.)

We are told that the Burmese, as they saw that great missionary, Adoniram Judson, moving among them, engaged in his work and labour of love, used to say, "There goes Jesus Christ's man."

In feudal times there was a ceremony called the act of *homage*. The vassal who had attached himself for support and protection to a feudal lord, knelt in the presence of his fellow-vassals, put his hands within those of his lord, and took a solemn oath to be his *homo*, his man, and as such to serve him faithfully, even unto death. Each one of us is to be God's man, His *homo*, and as such we are to render to God our supreme *homage*.

It is He that made us, and not we ourselves. It is He that endowed us with intelligence, with affections, with will, and with a moral nature, thus creating us in His own image and after His own likeness. It is He that "delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love; in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of our sins." (Col. 1:13.) We are not our own. We were bought with a price. We are God's men.

In the shipwreck that occurred in Paul's voyage to Rome, he brought to the centurion who had charge of him, and to them who commanded the ship, a message of assurance: "Sirs, be of good cheer; for there stood by me this night an angel of *the God whose I am* and *whom also I serve*, saying Fear not." (Acts 27:23-24.)

Paul, though a prisoner, was the freest man on board. He was *nobody's man*. In the extremity of the storm, he was the master-spirit, and virtually took command of the ship and of all on board. He alone was calm and confident, and all looked to him for a renewal of courage and of hope. And so he was *everybody's man.* But first of all, and most of all, he was *God's man*, and he so declared himself. "There stood by me this night an angel of *the God whose I am and whom also I serve*, saying, Fear not Paul; thou must stand before Caesar: and lo, God hath granted unto thee all them that sail with thee." (Acts 27:23-24.)

Whose man ought you to be? Like Paul, you should be Nobody's man, Everybody's man, God's man. If you are God's man, you will be nobody's man. Like the Apostle, you will be free from all men. "The fear of man bringeth a snare; but whoso trusteth in the Lord shall be safe." (Prov. 29:25.) Marshal Foch, when he was in this country, was asked to suggest a motto for the young men of America. Taking his pen he wrote, "I fear God, and I fear nothing else." The regent Morton, as he stood by the grave of John Knox, said to those about him: "Here lies one who never feared the face of man."

Again, if you are God's man, you will be everybody's man. Though, like Paul, free from all men, you will like him, bring yourself into bondage to all. You will be an imitator of God, who serves all, making His sun to shine upon the evil and the good, and sending His rain upon the just and the unjust.

And, if you are God's man, you will be your own man. In Him alone can we find our freedom. Only He can liberate us from our own evil passions and the domination of sin. "If ye abide in my word," says Christ, "then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Let us, then, sum up in one sentence the whole matter:—*He who is God's man, and he alone, finds the true balance, the perfect equilibrium, of freedom and restraint.*

*Printed in the United States of America*

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01130 4542

Date Due

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| MY 7 -'48 | | | |
| [redacted] | | | |